

SPARSA COLLECTA
PART TWO

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL STAFF

C. K. BARRETT, Durham

A. F. J. KLIJN, Groningen — J. SMIT SIBINGA, Amsterdam

Editorial Secretary: H. J. DE JONGE, Leiden

VOLUME XXX



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL

1980

SPARSA COLLECTA

THE COLLECTED ESSAYS OF
W. C. VAN UNNIK

PART TWO

I PETER. CANON. CORPUS HELLENISTICUM
GENERALIA



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1980

ISBN 90 04 06260 2
90 04 06261 0

Copyright 1980 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	VII
-------------------	-----

I PETER

The Redemption in 1 Peter i 18-19 and the Problem of the First Epistle of Peter.	3
<i>(Mededelingen der Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 5 — no. 1, 1942)</i>	
The Teaching of Good Works in 1 Peter	83
<i>(New Testament Studies, I, 1954)</i>	
A Classical Parallel to 1 Peter ii 14 and 20	106
<i>(New Testament Studies, II, 1956)</i>	
Christianity according to 1 Peter.	111
<i>(The Expository Times, LXVIII, December 1956)</i>	

CANON

De la règle μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du canon	123
<i>(Vigiliae Christianae, Volume III, 1949)</i>	
Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη — a Problem in the early History of the Canon	157
<i>(Studia Patristica, IV, Berlin 1961)</i>	

CORPUS HELLENISTICUM

Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas; Second Report on the Corpus Hellenisticum.	175
<i>(New Testament Studies, III, 1957)</i>	
A Formula describing Prophecy	183
<i>(New Testament Studies, IX, 1963)</i>	
Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti.	194
<i>(Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII, 1964)</i>	

GENERALIA

Contemporary Problems in New Testament Scholarship. . .	217
<i>(Inaugural Lecture, February 17, 1947, Nijkerk)</i>	
Solitude and Community in the New Testament.	241
<i>(Vox Theologica, 28, 1957-58)</i>	
Jesus the Christ	248
<i>(New Testament Studies, VIII, 1962)</i>	
The Christian's Freedom of Speech in the New Testament .	269
<i>(Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 44, 1962)</i>	
The Semitic Background of <i>παρησία</i> in the New Testament.	290
<i>(Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 25 — no. 11)</i>	
Die Rücksicht auf die Reaktion der Nicht-Christen als Motiv in der altchristlichen Paränese.	307
<i>(Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche; Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias, Berlin, 1964)</i>	
The Holy Spirit in the New Testament.	323
<i>(De Spiritu Sancto, 1964)</i>	

PREFACE

The first volume of *Sparsa Collecta* appeared as long ago as 1973. Professor Van Unnik did not live to see the two subsequent volumes appear that were envisaged. He died on March 17, 1978. After his death his colleagues and co-workers of the Department of New Testament and Hellenistic and Jewish Studies of the Theological Faculty of the University of Utrecht expressed to Mrs Van Unnik that they considered it their debt of honour to take over where the hand of the author had failed, and to see the projected volumes through the press. Mrs van Unnik graciously complied with their view. They are happy to present now *Sparsa Collecta II* in form and content (with one exception) as Van Unnik decided ten years ago when the idea of collecting his scattered articles came up first. They hope to be able to continue their task and to bring out within reasonable time the last volume. When the series is complete most of Van Unnik's scholarly work up to 1969 will have been republished.

It is our hope that the series can be continued to include also the work of the last ten years of Van Unnik's life which in so many respects were his most fruitful years. This would probably amount to three or four more volumes. Not until all of Van Unnik's scholarly work will have been collected will it be possible to appreciate fully its meaning and importance for New Testament scholarship in the widest sense of the word.

The editors wish to thank the publishers E. J. Brill, especially Mr T. A. Edridge the present director, for their co-operation in the continuation of the series after more than seven years.

As in the first volume all articles have been left unchanged except for a few minor corrections. The articles which appeared originally in Dutch have been translated into English. In the case of the first article this proved to be a difficult task. It dates from 1942 and clearly betrays the beginning scholar who presents his first solid work of New Testament interpretation and is at pains to set forth his argument and evidence in the greatest detail and with meticulous care. The mature scholar of the sixties and the seventies as most of his friends and colleagues knew him would have proceeded not with less care but with greater ease. But

Van Unnik cherished his work on 1 Peter i 18-19 and called it his New Testament doctoral thesis. The editors have done their utmost to keep the characteristics of the original but in a few cases had to choose where the Dutch was ambiguous or not clear.

The article "Die 'geöffneten Himmel' in der Offenbarungsvision des Apokryphon des Johannes", originally to be included in this volume, will appear in volume III.

Utrecht, Summer 1980

J. Reiling

G. Mussies

P. W. van der Horst

1 PETER

THE REDEMPTION IN 1 PETER I 18-19 AND THE PROBLEM OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER*

I. *Introductory Remarks*

In various passages in the New Testament the "Blood of Christ" is spoken of in a highly characteristic manner. These passages show that a decisive significance was attributed to it in man's relationship with God. A reason for this can be detected in the central position occupied by the Cross of Jesus in the preaching of the primitive church, since the cross was also connected with the shedding of blood. The significance of Jesus' death for salvation was explained, moreover, in terms borrowed from the O.T. sacrificial service where blood occupied a place of primary importance—an additional reason why a great deal of attention was paid to blood in the New Testament too.

Not only is "blood" mentioned in those passages concerning Communion (cf. Jn. vi; 1 Cor. x-xi: body and blood, or flesh and blood) where, combined with the other element according to Jewish linguistic usage,¹ it expressed the human nature of the Lord; "blood" is also mentioned on its own, as the means by which the relationship with God is restored and man is transformed. A few examples will illustrate this point:

Rom. iii 24-25 δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃν προσέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων.

Eph. i 7 ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ.

Eph. ii 13 νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Heb. ix 12 οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἁγία, αἰώνιαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος . . .
14. πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ Θεῷ.

* First appeared as "De verlossing 1 Petrus i 18-19 en het probleem van den eersten Petrusbrief", *Mededelingen der Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, deel 5, no. 1, p. 1-106.*

¹ Billerbeck, I, p. 730-731.

1 Jn. i 7 καὶ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας.

Rev. v 9 καὶ ἡγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς κτλ.

Rev. vii 14 οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης καὶ ἔπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἔλεύκαναν αὐτὰς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἁγίου.

These are not all, but only a few, of the most significant passages where this concept appears. It emerges, then, that the expression is not a peculiar phrase of one single writer, but that it is to be found at important points in almost the whole of the New Testament. In 1 Peter ² "Blood" is mentioned as much as twice—in i 2 and i 19. *The latter text will be the subject of a detailed investigation in this study*, but it should first be stressed that we are dealing with a concept central to the New Testament proclamation of Christ.

This New Testament theologoumenon did not remain unexploited. In the history of Christian theology and preaching the "blood of Christ" is constantly discussed in connection with atonement and redemption, two terms which, when used indiscriminately, are far too frequently regarded as being identical. All texts which mention this blood—i.e. the ones about the crucifixion of Jesus for which "blood" is the „concrete expression" ³—have been interpreted in the same way. The blood of the Lord was seen not only as possessing an atoning power in the sense of fulfilling the Law of the Old Testament and appeasing God, but also a redemptive, liberating power, as "ransom". The great significance which St Anselm's doctrine of atonement, as presented in theological writings and sermons, had—and still has—for the faith of many, has entailed the frequent discussion of the blood of Christ as the *means* by which the result—restored community with God—was obtained.

The text of 1 Peter i 18-19 must also be mentioned in this connection; indeed, it is of eminent importance, as we can see from various quotations. When discussing Christ's work in his *Grosser Katechismus* Luther overlooks other passages and only refers to

² The designation 1 Peter (abbreviated 1 Pet.) used in this essay does not imply any decision concerning authorship, which is still a matter of debate. Only at the end will this question be treated.

³ J. Behm in: Kittel, I, p. 175. The whole article on αἷμα, from which this quotation has been taken, is important. See also on this same word Bauer, Sp. 43-45 and de Keulenaar in: *Bijbelsch Woordenboek*, Roermond, 1941, col. 172-173, s.v. *Bloed* (with lit.).

1 Peter i: Jesus Christ is our Lord; this means simply "ein Erlöser . . . Die stücke aber so nacheinander ynn diesem artikel (i.e. the second of the so-called Apostles' Creed) folgen/ thuen nichts anders den das sie solche erlösung verkleren und ausdrücken/ wie und wodurch sie geschehen sey/ das ist/ . . . das er fur mich genug thete/ und bezalet was ich verschuldet habe/ nicht mit sylber noch gold, sondern mit seinem eigenen tewren blut".⁴ When Calvin points out in his *Institutes* that it is right to say that Christ earned us God's mercy and salvation, he too cites this passage in 1 Peter—in section 5, among the texts stating that he has paid the price of redemption.⁵ Even that influential reformed manual, the *Heidelberg Catechism*, attaches great importance to the passage as an expression of the work of Christ. The following quotation occurs in the same connection as in Luther. On the thirteenth Sunday, when Christology is being discussed, we find Question 34: "Wherefore callest thou him, Our Lord?" The answer is: "Because he hath redeemed us, both soul and body, from all our sins, not with gold or silver, but with his precious blood, and hath delivered us from all the power of the devil and thus made us his own property".⁶ The antithesis contained in this passage has obviously been taken from 1 Peter, as we see from the texts cited. The adverb "thus" proves that these apostolic words were seen as referring to the means by which our redemption came about. The high value attached to the passage appears above all from the fact that when, in the famous answer to Question 1, the nature of the Christian's consolation is described—so concisely and so superbly—this same means is mentioned, recalling the words of St Peter.⁷

These quotations show that we are dealing with a doctrinal point fundamental to all the reformed religions, a point for which 1 Peter i 18-19 is the proof-text. Largely because of its use in the catechisms which, taught at school and preached from the pulpits, had such a profound influence, this passage and its interpretation have become common property.

The far-reaching effects of a current like Pietism must also be mentioned in association with the importance of this text for

⁴ Luther, *Der grosse Katechismus*, II 2, ed. O. Clemen, *Luthers Werke in Auswahl*, Bd. IV, Berlin, 1935, p. 55.

⁵ J. Calvinus, *Institutio Christianae Religionis*, II 17 ed. A. Tholuck, Edinburgh, 1874, vol. I, p. 367.

⁶ *The Heidelberg Catechism*, tr. H. Harbaugh, Chambersburg, 1856, p. 65.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Question 1.

Christian doctrine. For the Pietists the text would have to be very attractive not only because the blood of Christ is mentioned, but because He Himself is designated as "the Lamb". That these elements should be given such a carnal form was an additional reason why the text became a centre of attention, while opposition to a "distasteful blood-theology" also led people to enquire about the significance of so controversial a doctrine.

We thus see that the expression is important not only for the theology of the New Testament but also for Dogmatics. For centuries, now, 1 Pet. i 18-19 has been interpreted by almost everyone, in consistence with the words contained in the catechisms. But this very fact does not absolve us of the duty of looking more closely and asking: what is being said? what is being conveyed? what does the text mean? For this reason a few indications were given in the foregoing pages concerning the great role which these verses have played in Christian theology, for, in the case of passages such as this, there is always the risk *that they be treated as oft repeated words and accepted without any further investigation*. The danger is that our ears become so attuned to the sound of this translation that we look no further.

In the case of this and similar texts which deal with central Biblical concepts it is difficult not to give the words a content before we actually read them, especially when they have been strongly conditioned by dogmatic developments. This, for example, is what has happened to "redeem". To our minds the word has religious associations which were not necessarily possessed by the original Greek, while the basic elements of the word have overtones which are no longer familiar to our language.

This simple and well-known point had to be recalled briefly before any attempt at interpretation is made. It is precisely in Biblical exegesis that it often appears to have been forgotten.

II. *The Text*

From a first glance at the text it is evident that it depends on the preceding passage. Vs. 18 begins with a participle. It is therefore desirable that vs. 17 also be taken into account as the main clause. Although this verse will not be treated in detail, the link between verses 17 and 18-19 must be considered since a dependence exists from start to finish and the nature of this dependence is by no

means entirely clear from the shade of meaning which the participle may have. Here, too, the context is of decisive importance and it is dangerous to treat the words as a proof-text out of place. The sequence in verses 20-21 contains certain appositions concerning the person of Christ. The whole passage runs as follows: (17) *καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε*, (18) *εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου*, (19) *ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ*, (20) *προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ἡμᾶς*. (21) *τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς Θεὸν τὴν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα, ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα εἶναι εἰς Θεόν*.

As far as the verses which we are examining are concerned Nestle's text, which is reproduced here, offers no variants. In the critical apparatus of Tischendorf's edition, however, we also have the following: ⁸

I. *κ** read *φθαρτοῦ* instead of *φθαρτοῖς*, while the same manuscript replaced *ἀργυρίῳ* by *ἀργυρίου*, which must be regarded as a genitive of value. So *φθαρτοῖς* is not independent (cf. p. 14 and 50), but subordinate to the price of the silver. The translation should therefore read: "perishable silver", as we read in the Peshitta, in Luther, Moffat and the translation published by the Canisius-vereeniging.⁹ This reading is contradicted by the vast majority of the manuscripts and early translations, and the fact that in *χρυσίῳ* and *αἵματι* the dative is retained, whereby the construction becomes somewhat crippled and broken. Furthermore, it will appear from the exegesis which follows that this is a reading determined by a particular interpretation which is incorrect, for the meaning of *φθαρτοῖς* is no longer understood.

⁸ *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. C. Tischendorf, ed. VIIIa critica maior, Lipsiae 1872, vol. II, p. 277.

⁹ Translations consulted: Vulgata, ed. Nestle⁴, 1921; Peshitta, ed. Bible Society, 1920; Statenvertaling (with notes), 1637; Vissering (with notes) ²1859; Synodale Vertaling (with notes), 1868; Leidsche Vertaling (with notes) 1912; Canisiusvertaling (with notes) 1938; A. M. Brouwer (with notes) 1938; in addition to these Dutch translations I have consulted the German one by Luther, the French one by Segond, the English Revised Version and Moffatt, not to mention the translations in the commentaries by Baljon, Van Nes and Windisch (see note 11).

2. The transposition of ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαράδοτου has no exegetical significance.

3. In C, 31 and Cyril we read τῷ τιμῷ αἵματι in vs. 19. Some scholars have therefore felt the addition of the article to be necessary, although the majority disagree. It is interesting to observe that nearly all modern translations follow this undefensible reading either consciously or unconsciously. Only the Revised Version, Kühl¹⁰ and van Nes are exceptions in not inserting the article. This is not yet the place in which to go into the exegetical tenor of such an addition. It should simply be pointed out that very many scholars regard the article as indispensable, although the text itself does not provide it. *Is this a coincidence, or is it the result of a certain exposition* which does not actually suit the text? The answer will emerge later.

III. Survey of the present state of exegesis

Whoever looks at the exposition of our text in various commentaries¹¹ will soon realise that a great deal of attention has been devoted to it, but that virtually the same parallels are always being offered and the same possibilities considered. This does not

¹⁰ E. Kühl in his commentary which will be mentioned in note 11.

¹¹ Commentaries consulted: the Greek church in: J. A. Cramer, *Catena Graecorum Patrum in N.T.*, tomus VIII, Oxford, 1844; Calvin, ed. A. Tholuck, tom. VII, Berolini 1831; Hugo Grotius in: *Critici Sacri*, tom. VIII, Amstelodami 1698; E. Kühl in: H. A. W. Meyer, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch*⁵, Göttingen 1886; R. Knopf, in: idem.⁷, 1912; J. M. S. Baljon, *De Katholieke Brieven*, Utrecht, 1904; Ch. Bigg in: *International Critical Commentary*², Edinburgh 1910; W. Vrede in: *Die h. Schrift des N.T.*, Bonn 1915; G. Wohlenberg in *Zahn's Kommentar*³, Leipzig 1923; H. M. van Nes in: *Tekst en Uitleg*², Groningen 1926; S. Greydanus in: *Kommentaar op het N.T.*, Amsterdam 1929; H. Windisch in: *Lietzmanns Handbuch zum N.T.*², Tübingen 1931; A. J. Mason in: Ch. Gore, *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*³, London 1932; F. Hauck in: *Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk*³, Göttingen 1937; U. Holzmeister, *Commentarius in epistulas SS. Petri et Judae, I Epistula Prima S. Petri*, in: *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae* III 13, Parisiis 1937. An extensive discussion by A. Ritschl is to be found in his: *Die christliche Lehre der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*³, Bd. II, Bonn 1889, p. 178-179, 222-223, 225 and 239. Furthermore there is a brief monograph on this passage which, oddly enough, is not mentioned in any of the commentaries I have consulted: J. Dalmer, *Zu 1 Petri* 18-19 in: *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie* II, 3, Gütersloh 1898, p. 77-87. A. Schlatter's commentary *Petrus und Paulus nach dem ersten Petrusbrief*, Stuttgart 1937, provides no explanation or elucidation of 1:18-19 or of any other point discussed in my essay which could cause me to alter what I have said.

dispense us, however, of the need to provide a survey of the present state of exegesis, for the choice of the expositors differs in detail even if they agree in the main. It is these differences which must be taken into consideration, for it is here that we see that scholars have spotted difficulties and have tried to get round them. Such a survey is also necessary in order to avoid the charge of levity, so frequently made whenever an exegesis *differs from all current views*. Suffice it to say that the interpretations that have been made to date have not been neglected: on the contrary, a meticulous confrontation of the text and the expositions has brought to light the questions which I shall be tackling. The following survey lays no claim to being complete or mentioning all the commentaries I have consulted, particularly those of previous centuries.¹² I believe, however, that none of the points treated by those commentaries and relevant to my own study has been omitted. This is the main thing since my object is not to provide a catalogue of names but to gain an insight into the text and its context. For the sake of clarity I shall be following one of the most recent scholarly interpretations, that of Windisch. I shall not assume the concision of his *Handbuch* but shall elaborate on some of his brief statements. Deviations from, and additions to, this exegesis can then be appropriately mentioned at the right place, while matters which Windisch does not treat, but which others do, can be tackled afterwards.

a) *Cohesion*. According to Windisch this verse is a part of a piece of baptismal paraenesis, i 13-ii 10. The verses 18-19 form the third motif (vs. 16 the first, vs. 17 the second) of an exhortation urging the addressees to lead a holy life, based on the memory of the redemption.

Windisch, with whom Hauck agrees, sees here the appearance of a new idea coordinated with the preceding one, but does not mention the dependence expressed in the participle. Holzmeister establishes a link with the exhortation to holiness for which the redemption is the principal motive: the "excellencia" appears from four ap-positions, viz. a) from the price, vs. 18 and 19; b) from the condition from which we are redeemed, vs. 18; c) from the time (before the foundation of the world and at that time), vs. 20; d) from the

¹² This crucial passage has, of course, often been treated in a broader context, in N.T. Theologies, for example. I have mentioned only one such work.

glorious consequences, vs. 21. Many other expositors establish a close link with vs. 17 by regarding the participle construction 18-19 either (1) as a motivation of "with fear": man will be urged on to so scrupulous a conduct by the knowledge of how high a price was paid for him (so Bigg, Mason, Greydanus), or (2) as a motivation of the "if you invoke as Father etc": the readers must think of how God has become their Father (thus Kühl, Baljon, van Nes). Knopf, who opts for the first possibility (he calls this a secondary cause; the first was God, the impartial judge), says that we should actually expect another sequel, viz. knowing "that you shall also be called to judgement". He speaks of a new idea—a reference to the love of God which must lead to gratitude and to a serious consideration of the readers' duties. Wohlenberg regards this as possible, but gives a slightly different interpretation, viz. that the Christians possess the knowledge of how to live piously as obedient children before God their Father (14a, 17a). Ritschl dismisses the first view in so many words because the "fear" had already received a motivation in the "if you etc.". Nor does he see a causal connection between the clauses of vs. 17, but declares his acceptance of the second explanation. Dalmer approached the matter from an entirely different angle. He points out that vs. 17 forms a self-contained whole and requires no further addition, let alone such a one as is given in 18-19 (this would only have been necessary if the emphasis in the preceding sentence had been on "who judges impartially" or on "father", since there is no antithesis between "father" and "fear", fear not being submissive, cf. ii 18; iii 2, 15). The fear is motivated by the fact that the Christians still live in exile and have not yet attained their hope. Unlike Hoffmann (whom he cites), he also excludes the possibility of a link with vs. 22 because, amongst other things, vs. 21 clearly marks the end of the sentence. After an extensive discussion of the following points he comes to the conclusion that vs. 18-19 do indeed belong to vs. 17 grammatically, but that judging from their content, they introduce an entirely new motif for the preceding exhortation. It would appear from iii 1-7 that Peter did not attach excessive importance to grammatical precision. In order that his readers should not be scared away by his high demands and give up hope, he reminds them of the reason for their hope. Dalmer thus sees in vs. 14-17 an explanation of the first words contained in the theme-verse 13 ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, νήφοντες τελείως

ἐλπίζατε, while vs. 18-21 are an elaboration of the last words τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

b) *Memory of the redemption through Christ's blood.* Here Windisch refers to I Cor. vi 20 ἡγοράσθητε τιμῆς; I Cor. vii 23 τιμῆς ἡγοράσθητε and Tit. ii 14 Jesus Christ ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἵνα λυτρώσεται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθάρσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον. To him it is quite clear that the Christian doctrine of redemption is here to be compared to the ancient ransom of slaves through the deity, since the price is mentioned. For the nature of this ransom he refers to Lietzmann's commentary on Gal. v 1.¹³ Lietzmann says that Deissmann¹⁴ has again elucidated the ideas connected with this notion of "redemption" by comparing it to Greek legal customs known to us from Delphic inscriptions. These show that a slave could be freed by his master's receiving a ransom from the temple funds. The deity thereby buys the slave and gives him his freedom. At this point Lietzmann too refers to the above-cited passages in I Cor. and dismisses Th. Zahn's objection¹⁵ according to which there is no question of a true ransom but only of a fictitious purchase, whereby the slave himself first had to pay the money to the temple, with the remark that we are not here concerned with details but with the prevailing thought pattern. In I Peter the price is not the money (cf. Is. lii 3 LXX, the injunction to Zion to loosen its fetters, ὅτι τάδε λέγει κύριος Δωρεὰν ἐπράθητε, καὶ οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε), but the precious blood of Christ.¹⁶ In ancient times, according to Windisch, men could name blood as a price since, in sacral dealings, money frequently replaced the original requirement of blood. He translates λυτρώω as "ransom".

¹³ H. Lietzmann, *An die Galater*³ in: *Handbuch zum N.T.*, Tübingen 1932, p. 36-37.

¹⁴ A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*⁴, Tübingen 1923, p. 271-281.

¹⁵ Th. Zahn, *An die Römer*¹⁻², Leipzig 1910, p. 179 n. 51-p. 181 ad Rom. iii 24. In view of the fact that my own explanation follows completely different lines and lays no emphasis on ransom it is unnecessary to treat Zahn's objections in detail. A reference to this discussion is sufficient. Holzmeister agrees with Zahn as against Deissmann.

¹⁶ Windisch refers to I Clement vii 4 (ed. K. Bihlmeyer, Tübingen 1924) ἀπενίσσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ καὶ γινώμεν ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανόιας χάριν ὑπῆνεγκεν and xii 7 Rahab's scarlet cord, Jos. ii, is a sign ὅτι διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου λύτρωσις ἔσται πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν καὶ ἐλπίζουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν. But this reference is only valid if I Clement is definitely independent of I Pet.

In nearly all the other expositions we come across references to these same passages in Paul. This is part of the "eisernen Bestand" of the exegesis and it is in this light that the image is always considered. Sometimes other references are added, e.g. to Mk. x 45, Mt. xx 28 the Son of Man came to δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν; 1 Tim. ii 6 Jesus Christ ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων and other passages where λυτρόω or derivatives occur.¹⁷ The translation is usually "ransom", although some commentators follow the Statenvertaling and put "redeem" (Oort, van Nes, who, however, as appears from their notes, abide by the same interpretation). Whether the connection with the *sacral* manumission of slaves is regarded as a possibility (Hauck), or rejected decisively (Wohlenberg, Greydanus), ransom from bondage (Vrede) or slavery (since Chrysostom) is the generally accepted interpretation. Holzmeister leaves the choice between the two metaphors open. Wohlenberg, followed by Greydanus, agrees with Zahn, since Windisch's view contains "so manche Unebenheiten und Widersprüche, dass sie als eine Entgleisung und Verirrung zu gelten habe". He points out that the God of the Christians is not to be bought in the way that judges were bought by money and deities by sacrifices in Antiquity: the Christian is ransomed by precious blood. Greydanus does not go quite so far but says that the meaning follows clearly from the context. We may well sometimes be uncertain about whether λυτρόω should be rendered by "dimittere" or "redimere", but in this case there is no question of uncertainty. Everything points to the deliverance of Israel from Egypt: "that was, as it were, the fundamental deliverance of Israel, which is constantly being referred to", deliverance from slavery and from the Destroyer (an idea which can already be found in Grotius). Knopf sees simply a "geläufiges Bild", introduced by Paul into Christian terminology, and adheres to Deissmann's interpretation. There is no allusion to Is. lii 3 since that verse is completely different. Bigg, too, here regards the redemption from Egypt as a historical type. Ritschl starts with the use of λυτρόω in the LXX: it means "ransom", but the Hebrew גָּאֹל or פָּדָה does not contain the idea of "purchase" so much as the idea of "deliver" and "liberate".

¹⁷ Holzmeister names all these texts but will have nothing to do with the rationalistic view that Peter depends here on Paul. There is "similitudo in doctrina" but "magna differentia quoad formam". In LXX it is used of the earthly salvation wrought by God.

Thus the LXX has abandoned the etymological significance, and this is equally true of the N.T. (Acts vii 35; Lk. i 68; ii 38; Heb. xi 35; Eph. i 4; iv 30). Ritschl too sees the prototype in the deliverance from Egypt. In connection with the "active sins" mentioned here only the general idea of "liberate" can be right, not the more specific idea of "ransom". Kühl argued against this view, saying that it does not do justice to the more detailed explanation of the price in vs. 18. Even Dalmer, who first left the question open and observed that the LXX offered both possibilities, agrees with Kühl in view of the fact that the price is mentioned so clearly.

Windisch does not comment on the nature of the antithesis in these verses and does not discuss φθαρτοῖς. This adjective has always been translated by "perishable (things)". Baljon contents himself with the statement that the antithesis emphasizes the preciousness of the sacrifice. For φθαρτοῖς Kühl refers to Winer,¹⁸ where we read that it could look as though we have an adjective in the plural going with two nouns, but in fact it is the main word: "silver or gold" must be regarded as an explanatory apposition. The notion φθαρτά cannot immediately be connected with the concept of gold and silver (Grotius and others, including Holzmeister, refer to vs. 7 ἀπολλύμενα); it suggests that the author is thinking of the price, and Kühl continues: "Dieser Begriff der Vergänglichkeit ist massgebend für die richtige Auffassung der folgenden Versen, die den positiven Gegensatz dazu bringen, also von einem seinem Wesen nach unvergänglichen Lösegeld reden müssen". Greydanus says that the author gives as an example of things subject to corruption the least destructible namely gold and silver, mentioning the most precious last. Knopf also observes that some editors rightly put the apposition between brackets, but the price given here is higher, i.e. the precious blood of Christ. Van Nes writes as follows: "The ransom is considerably more precious than perishable gold and silver. On the contrary it is something imperishable, something of a unique value, the precious blood". In Bigg we find this paraphrase: "Silver and gold ... are dross compared with the price paid for you". In his *Gnomon*¹⁹ Bengel translates τιμὴ simply as "incorruptibilis". This imperishability of Christ's blood, which is not self-evident, can be elucidated, as

¹⁸ G. B. Winer, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*⁷, Leipzig 1867, p. 491.

¹⁹ J. A. Bengel, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*, Stuttgart 1860, ad loc.

it was by Ritschl, by referring to the statements about His person in vs. 20-21 (so also Kühl, Dalmer and Knopf). Vrede simply speaks of the blood as a price of "unendlichem Werte" and Hauck writes: "das Kostbarste, was es gibt, das Blut des Erlösers, diene als Mittel zu ihrer Befreiung". Holzmeister, too, speaks of a "pretium infinitum", as shown by the antithesis, viz. that the price does not consist of perishable things like gold and silver; he refers to Pelagius: "Si enim homo a servo parva pecunia comparato continuam exigit servitutem, quanto magis ille, qui nos sua morte redemit". I shall say more about this in section d (17 ff).

c) *What are we redeemed from?* This is the ματαία ἀναστροφή πατροπαράδοτος. Windisch translates the last term as "von den Vätern her überkommenen Wandel", but says in the explanatory notes that the word actually means "einem jeden von seinem Vater überliefert", with reference to Mt. xi 27 πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου. For the Jews the heritage of ancestors was a ground for exculpation.²⁰ He then elucidates the meaning of πατροπαράδοτος with certain parallels.²¹ μάταιος should be compared with Eph. iv 17 καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν and 2 Clement xix 12 (ed. Bihlmeyer) καὶ ἐσκοτίσμεθα τὴν διάνοιαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν ματαίων. This is indeed an allusion to idolatry, Acts xiv 15 εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ματαίων ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ θεὸν ζῶντα and Lev. xvii 7 καὶ οὐ θύσουσιν ἔτι τὰς θυσίας αὐτῶν τοῖς ματαίοις, οἷς αὐτοὶ ἐκπορνεύουσιν ὀπίσω αὐτῶν. With great exactness Greydanus explains ἐκ (cf. i 3, 22, 23; ii 9) with the words: "they were stranded already and had been captured, and therefore not only needed protection, but also deliverance, from"; τῆς that well known, dreadful.

According to Baljon μάταιος was used in the LXX for מוֹשָׁל, מוֹשָׁלָה, the insignificant character of a person or a thing. It is applied to idols (cf. Jer. ii 5). Wohlenberg provides plenty of synonyms: "eitlen, gehaltlosen, nichtigen Wandel, der zu keinem lebensvollen

²⁰ Billerbeck, III, p. 763.

²¹ *Clem. Homiliae* XI 13: some say that they would be godless if they forsook the objects of worship inherited from their fathers; Diodorus, *Bibl. Hist.* IV 8, 5 μηδὲ τὴν πατροπαράδοτον εὐσέβειαν διαφυλάττειν; Philo, *de spec. leg.* IV 150 ὀφείλουσι γὰρ παῖδες παρὰ γονέων <δίχα> τῶν οὐσιῶν κληρονομεῖν ἔθνη πάτρια, οἷς ἐνετράφησαν καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν σπαργάνων συνεβιάσαν. We find more examples in Wohlenberg, p. 37, n. 80, who clings to the etymological significance. Knopf also referred to Dionysius of Corinth, ap. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* IV 23, 10 πατροπαράδοτον ἔθος Ῥωμαίων Ῥωμαῖοι διαφυλάττοντες.

Ziele führte, vielmehr Tod und Verderbnis zu Ergebnis hatte". Kühl puts it differently: "der das Ziel göttlichen Wohlgefallens, dem jede ἀναστροφὴ zustreben muss, nicht erzielt". Pagan life was devoid of content (Hauck); it was useless and fruitless (Greydanus, who also refers to Jas. i 26; Tit. iii 9; 1 Cor. xv 17; "this way of life lacked all solidity, substance, truth, salvation and was therefore struck by the curse"). Knopf thinks it possible that walking in sin ("Sündenwandel") is meant in the passage, but he prefers to think of idolatry (in addition to the passages mentioned by Windisch, he refers to LXX Ez. viii 10; Hos. v 11). This is because idols are nothing (Rom. i 23), dumb (1 Cor. xii 2), helpless images (Rev. ix 20). Vrede defines it as "den eitlen Götzendienst der jeglichen sittlichen und religiösen Gehaltes entbehrte", while Holzmeister simply says that it amounts to "mala". He refers to Acts xiv 15, 1 Cor. iii 20 and other passages where the root appears indicating "rem moraliter malam", idols in the LXX. Kühl is an exception to this chorus: he rejects the idea of paganism because of the subsequent adjective (see p. 16 and 32 n. 34). But Dalmer too had rejected this view, albeit for other reasons: in the Old Testament the idols themselves are indeed referred to in this way, but not their cult (he refers to 2 Chron. xi 15, besides the already mentioned passages) and in Eph. iv 17 the word may perhaps refer to idolatry, but it only implies the "Nichtigkeit und Haltlosigkeit", not the "Sündhaftigkeit". Thus, in 1 Pet. i 18 the lack of content is conveyed (sin lacks content too), but it is not said that sin is an enslaving power. Dalmer refers to the context in which 1 Peter talks of the living hope (i 3, 13, 21). This also explains μάταιος: outside Christ their life was empty, for they knew no hope. "In Christo hat ihnen Gott eine Hoffnung geschenkt und damit hat ihr Leben einen Inhalt und ein Ziel bekommen".

πατροπαράδοτος: we have already seen that Wohlenberg sticks strictly to the etymological meaning. Greydanus thinks this is wrong because Peter did not know the readers personally but had in mind their family circumstances. The uncleanness (iv 13) had already been inherited by one generation from another. Kühl, Baljon and Knopf think that the influence of upbringing, education and example is what is implied. The word might refer to the Jewish ceremonial service (cf. Mt. xv 3), says Vrede, but this is unlikely, since Peter was writing to pagan Christians. Most exegetes, therefore, see this adjective as an allusion to paganism (Baljon, Greyda-

nus, Knopf, Hauck, Holzmeister who adds: "cum vitiis ipsi continuo annexis"). Bigg explains this by referring to Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* X, and Minucius Felix, *Octavius* VI, both dealing with the pagans' objections to conversion to Christianity on account of their respect for their ancestral cult. The author would never have referred to Judaism in such a way, observes Wohlenberg, because the Jews respected tradition (Gen. xviii 19; Deut. vi 7; xi 19). Of the more recent exegetes Köhl is the only one who sees here a reference to the Jews, as he believes that the entire epistle was written to Jewish Christians, since the Jews, more than any other nation, stood under the ban of tradition. Precisely because they had a Law which had to regulate their life, their life could be called "futile": it did not achieve its purpose.

The idea expressed by the words as a whole is described by Hauck as follows: "Verknechtung unter die Sünde und Eitelkeit . . . Dass ihr Leben alles wertvollen Inhalts entbehrte, war der Jammer ihrer Heidenzeit . . . Dass diese Lebensform ihnen von der Sitte der Väter . . . aufgeprägt wurde, bedeutete eine Knechtschaft unter das Gesetz der Massenwirkung (Sitte, Umwelt), von dem sich der Einzelne unmöglich selbst lösen kann. So waren sie Sklaven gleich . . .". On these lines also Köhl, Vrede and Wohlenberg. The latter elaborates on the idea still further: they are bound in all sorts of ways "an den ganzen Wust heidnischen Götzendienstes und Aberglaubens, an die Schreckensherrschaft des Lasters und der Sünde (iv 3; 1 Cor. v 9-13; vi 2-11) und demgemäss des Todes, des Königs des Schreckens (Job xviii:14) und des Teufels (Heb. ii 14)". Holzmeister sums up: "culpa quae in tali vita moraliter mala per saecula continuata continebatur, exegit satisfactionem teste Rom. iii 25". According to Knopf λυτρόω means ransom from slavery everywhere. The Lord or Master can be various things: Satan, demons, Sin, Death, etc. Since they were idolaters they had fallen into a life of sin (Rom. i 22 ff.) perpetuated by examples. Yet the last adjective refers, rather, to cultic observances. In this metaphor one would also expect to find the name of the Master from whose service the Christian is ransomed, but this is not the case. The ἀναστροφή is not conceived personally as is ἀμαρτία or σάρξ in Paul. To the question: who was the Master? the first readers would undoubtedly have answered: Satan and the demons (1 Cor. xii 2; x 19): then follows this remarkable concluding statement: "aber ob der Gedanke an die satanische Verknechtung wirklich hinter den Worten des Verf. steht, kann nicht mit Sicherheit gesagt werden"!

d) *The likening of Christ to a lamb without blemish.* According to Windisch this is a way of introducing the Jewish concept of sacrifice. Cf. Ex. xii 5 πρόβατον τέλειον ἄρσεν ἐνιαύσιον ἔσται ὑμῖν· ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρνῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρίφων λήμψεσθε and Lev. xxiii 12-13 καὶ ποιήσετε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν ᾗ ἂν φέρετε τὸ δράγμα, πρόβατον ἁμωμον ἐνιαύσιον εἰς ὁλοκαύτωμα τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τὴν θυσίαν αὐτοῦ δύο δέκατα σεμιδάλεως ἀναπεποιημένης ἐν ἐλαίῳ· θυσία τῷ κυρίῳ. ὁσμη εὐωδίας κυρίῳ as well as Is. lii 3 (see p. 11) and liii 7 ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη, καὶ ὡς ἄμνος ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος, οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, cf. Heb. ix 14 (see p. 3) and 26 νυνὶ δὲ ἄπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται. The most acceptable is the memory of the Paschal lamb "das mit seinem Blut und Fleisch die Erlösung aus dem Diensthause Aegypten einleitete", cf. 1 Cor. v 7 καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός, with reference to O. Schmitz (see below p. 24 n. 24). The whole concept is related to the one in Paul, although there is not necessarily direct dependence. Cf. also E. Klostermann on Mk. x 45.²²

We now come to the second part of the antithesis in our verses. In the exposition of the first part various things have already been said about this point (see p. 13 f). Kühl writes: "das τίμιον dieses notwendigen und wirklich gezahlten Preises muss in der Unvergänglichkeit bestehen". This predicate (viz. the imperishableness) is elaborated in vs. 20-21, but also in the adjectives ἁμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος: "unvergänglich dauern kann nur etwas, was unverworfen ist mit befleckendem, sündhaftem Wesen; durch die Schuld-befleckung verfällt alles der φθορά, der Christus als sündloser entnommen ist". That this thought can be expressed by these adjectives appears from Heb. ix 12-14 (see p. 3 and 1 Pet. i 4). αἵματι not only means death but the surrender of life in a violent death. Unlike Ritschl, Kühl does not consider the connection with the concept of sacrifice necessary. According to Greydanus ἀλλά expresses a strong contrast. That τίμιος (valuable, precious, expensive; then: honourable) should come first is simply for the sake of emphasis: "however precious silver and gold may be, blood, human blood, is of infinitely greater value, let alone the blood of Christ our Lord". The article is omitted in order to stress the preciousness of the blood. Even Mason says: "the blood is infinitely more 'precious', as being that of the Messiah Himself".

²² E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium*² in: *Handbuch zum N.T.*, Tübingen 1926, p. 122 f.

According to Kühl $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ does not express a simple comparison but a truly existing relationship. We do not need to translate it as "durch kostbares Blut, wie es das Blut eines unbefleckten Lammes ist" but "durch kostbares Blut (Christi), kostbar, da es ja das Blut u.s.w. ist" (for the apposition placed first see e). $\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ can only be meant as an image, otherwise we would get the absurd idea that Christ's blood is as precious as that of a lamb. This is also how Baljon explains it, while, according to Knopf, it gives the reason (see vs. 14).

In elucidating the apposition Windisch, as we saw, perceives the combination of a number of themes. Others have examined meticulously the various words in order to reach a more definite conclusion. Kühl distinguishes three possible origins 1) the O.T. sacrifice (Brouwer, for example, thinks of the sin offering, and refers to Jn. i 29); 2) the O.T. Paschal history, so Ritschl; 3) Is. liii 7. After rejecting 1 and 2 he chooses the last. In rejecting 1 he points out that it is generally acknowledged that Is. liii was also in the author's mind, since the lamb only occupied a subordinate position in the sacrifices. $\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$ LXX = אֶמְוָם of the sacrificial animals, but never $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ which always has a moral sense. $\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$ can also be used in this way. In consequence both words can be explained in the same—moral—sense. At this point Kühl makes two important objections: "Eine Beziehung auf dem Opferritus liegt . . . um so ferner, als der Gegensatz $\omicron\upsilon$ $\phi\theta\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ auch nicht im mindesten darauf vorbereitet" (quite unlike Heb. ix 12-14) and above all that "die alttestamentliche Opfer wohl eine schuldbedeckende, 'expiatorische, aber nicht redemptorische Bedeutung' . . . haben, wie sie durch $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$. . . gefordert wird", as B. Weiss had already observed. Explanation 2 seems to be given by $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\acute{\omega}$ and $\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$. The lack of the article does not argue against it (the author may well have been thinking of a specific lamb, according to Baljon), but the different use of words does (N.T. $\tau\acute{o}$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$, Ex. xii LXX $\pi\rho\acute{o}\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$, not $\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ as here; $\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$ not in that context). Furthermore, the object of indicating the high value of the blood is not achieved in this manner: we would expect to hear something about the nature of Him, Who has given His blood. That is why Kühl chooses 3: that Is. liii had an influence on the Christology of the epistle appears from ii 22-24. This chapter has nothing to do with sacrifice, but deals with the patience (the image of the lamb) and the innocence (other expressions) of the Suffering

Servant of the Lord, clearly conveyed by the two adjectives (cf. Rev. xiv 5). Patience and innocence make this blood valuable. While Baljon accepted this interpretation it made no impression on others. Wohlenberg says that the allusion to Is. liii is nothing but an unimportant auxiliary idea. Because of the deliverance he thinks of the redemption from Egypt, Ex. xii. ἄσπιλος does not appear in the LXX, but in Symmachus' later translation, Job xv 15. ἄμωμος is often the same as תמים, which is translated by τέλειος in Ex. xii, but which can really be regarded as an equivalent. An arbitrary lamb cannot have been intended since it must be connected with a single, fundamental deed of redemption coupled with the shedding of blood: that can only be the Exodus. That God had predestined the lamb is reminiscent of Jn. i 29 and 36 ὁ ἄμνός τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. In order to strengthen his interpretation still further Wohlenberg also refers to the fact that the Paschal lamb had to be removed from the herd four days previously, Ex. xii 3-6, cf. preordained in vs. 20. By and large Greydanus gives the same interpretation, although he also adds a few comments of his own: ἄμωμος, without blemish, blameless (Num. vi 14; xix 2; Eph. i 4; Phil. ii 15, cf. 2 Cor. vi 3; viii 20; 2 Pet. ii 13) and ἄσπιλος without stain (1 Tim. vi 14; Jas. i 27; 2 Pet. iii 14, cf. verb and noun of the stem μωμ- and σπιλ- in the N.T.). The first of these words would then mean "the Lord's own condition . . . His perfection in being, quality, nature, disposition, so that He was such that there was nothing reproachable about Him"; the second "tells us that He could not even be externally sullied by any fault" (this also tallies with Wohlenberg's opinion). "However much he is tempted, attacked and misjudged in every way . . . etc., He never lets Himself do or say anything that is not right, cf. ii 23; Is. liii 7". This metaphor is taken from the deliverance from Egypt, for Is. liii is closely connected with the sacrificial service and consequently with the Paschal lamb: the yearly Paschal lamb was a memorial of the single Paschal lamb of the Exodus. That which belongs together must not be split up. Vs. 18 points to this too. Kühl's objections are not valid because λυτρόω also stands for Israel's deliverance, Ex. vi 6; xv 13; Ps. cv 10. Ex. xii on the Paschal lamb is substantially the same as 1 Peter: the Apostle did not need to quote it literally if he knew what happened at the Paschal feast. For ἄμωμος in sacrificial terminology see Ex. xxix 1; Lev. i 3; xiv 10, and elsewhere.

Knopf points out that first the price, the precious means, is treated, but that we then come to a new group of ideas: the atoning power of sacrificial death and blood. This was generally acknowledged in Antiquity, and it was with this that the frequently recurring idea of the purifying powers of Jesus' sacrificial blood was connected in primitive Christianity. The Jewish and pagan cults kept these ideas alive or men clung to the atoning power because the gods had once marked out this path. Insofar as this thought was reflected upon it was referred to as substitution, gift and ransom (see the passages under b). "So sehen wir, dass wir es 1 Pet. i 18 f. mit übernommenem, längst geprägtem Gedankengute zu tun haben". The antithesis could be expected to be different, but although this is not factually stated the imperishability is expressed in what follows; also what is said in vs. 19, determines the preciousness of the blood. Christ as Lamb is also mentioned elsewhere in the N.T. (for the passages see above). Jesus is likened to a Paschal lamb because He died on the Passover and because the deliverance of the Christians links up perfectly with the redemption from Egypt. But this does not exclude other ideas since the blood of the Paschal lamb does not purify from sin; sheep and lambs do indeed appear in many pagan and Jewish lustration rites; the influence of Is. liii is unmistakable here as elsewhere (ch. ii); at this point, too, the author is clearly in a definite tradition: in consequence much of the controversy over this passage vanishes: it is impossible to say which image has had the most influence.

The view of Vrede and Bigg is similar to that of Windisch, although they emphasize the sinlessness suggested by the epithets. Bigg points out that *ἄμωμος* was also applied to sacrificial animals by Philo (*De agricultura* 29) and used in a moral sense in Ps. xv 2. He answers the question of whether the Pascha is "ransom", denying it on the one hand and confirming it on the other (as a type). He refers to a Midrash on Ex. xii 22: Israel is delivered from Egypt with the blood of the Paschal lamb and the blood of circumcision. He regards the difference in words between Ex. xii and 1 Pet. "a mere superficial difficulty". According to Holzmeister the Apostle is referring to the price: *τίμιος* is a "vox Petrina". After blood he explains: "Salvatoris, qui revera fuit hostia", and refers to Heb. ix and x. The *dignitas* of the sacrifice of the lamb (Is. liii 7; Jn. i 29-36; 1 Cor. v 7; Rev.—without a closer specification of the

motifs) lies in the adjectives. These can express it "primum ab hostia arcet vitium internum, ob quod ipsa vituperari debet (μέμφομαι Mal. 1, 7 s.), alterum maculam extrinsecus ei aspersam", a typical Petrine connection. Dalmer too sees an allusion to the value of the blood in the apposition. If it had been no more than a comparison with the Paschal lamb these words would be purely ornamental (against Ritschl). They designate the nature which the Paschal lamb possessed, but they do not explain why the blood is a ransom. The derivation from Is. liii 7 is not an adequate explanation: sacrifice and deliverance cannot be connected. Deliverance from a futile life to the rebirth of hope can indeed be associated with the idea of sacrifice: that our life is filled with new hope is due to the forgiveness of sins in Christ's blood. The sacrificial animal can indeed be ἄμωμος and we need not attach any importance to the fact that ἄσπιλος is never used of sacrifices, but only in a moral sense. Yet, in the idea of sacrifice, we find no satisfactory explanation of the value of the suffering, since "stainless" is purely ritual. Christ's death as a sacrifice points to the atoning significance and explains the ransom of guilt and entry into a new life. The apposition explains the value. The designation "lamb" does not follow from the sacrifice, since other sacrificial animals were also slaughtered, but from ii 22 f., influenced by Is. liii (cf. also vs. 10 there). The guiltlessness explains the value: His obedience is the gift with which He has ransomed us.

e) *The placing of the apposition before Christ.* Windisch does not discuss the matter. Other commentators rightly consider the question of why the apposition is in such an odd place, while in translations the genitive Χριστοῦ is always directly connected with αἷματι. This is because, according to Kühn, it is an explanation of "precious" and not of "Christ" (vs. 20-21). Knopf believes it to be necessary since an extensive apposition to Christ follows in vs. 20-21 and the link could not be made in any other way. Wohlenberg finds this genitive connection unnatural and unprecedented, just as Hoffmann had said. He mentions the possibility of taking Χριστοῦ as an apposition to ἀμνοῦ; "das ὡς diene dazu, die Kostbarkeit des vergossenen Blutes daraus zu erklären, dass es das Blut des als Lamm bezeichneten Christus war". He adds, on the other hand, that an ἀμνὸς ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος without an article in connection with ὡς designating the nature of the object, could

hardly refer to a person who has paid with his blood: it is therefore understandable that sometimes an article or a demonstrative is inadvertently inserted. Another possibility is to take ὥς in a comparative sense and to supplement αἵματι; but there was no reason, indeed no justification, for calling the blood of a Paschal lamb precious, even if it were stainless. τίμιον must refer to Christ's blood, otherwise αἵματι would have to be repeated again before "Χριστοῦ": you have been ransomed with precious blood, and as blood has been shed by a lamb so it has been shed by Christ. But this completion before Χριστοῦ is "hart". Hoffmann's attempt to connect Χριστοῦ κτλ. as a genitive absolute with what follows violates the cohesion and is wholly unnatural. Wohlenberg himself regards ὥς κτλ. as a participle construction belonging to vs. 20, puts a semi-colon after αἵματι, and translates and comments on the following words: "sintemal zu einem tadellosen und makellosen Lamme Christus vorherbestimmt worden war vor Grundlegung der Welt u.s.w." Greydanus mentions this view, as well as Bigg's remark (p. 4 of his commentary) that we have here a "nicety of style" also used by the great stylists of antiquity (he illustrates this with examples). He rejects also Hoffmann's explanation since no reason would then be given for the preciousness of the blood. In Kühl's interpretation this would follow from the stainlessness and not from the fact that it is Christ's blood, which only comes in second place. Nor does Greydanus accept Wohlenberg's translation since this does not account for the preciousness of the blood; the death of the Lord, which is obviously what he has in mind, is not mentioned, while the train of thought is oddly fragmented. He consequently settles for the usual connection: the apposition comes first for the sake of emphasis.

f) *How can this death benefit others?* Windisch sheds little light on this point (cf. his observations in b). In d) I discussed various views on the matter, but elsewhere we read remarks of a more consequential nature which, even if they do not get us much further in themselves, should be included for the sake of completeness. Mason said that the author does not explain this point (see vs. 2): "he rests upon the fact". Kühl too affirms that the questions have been left open: for whom is the suffering valuable? how can the blood of an innocent release us from the domination of sin? Not even the idea of sacrifice accounts for this. "Nur soviel ergibt sich

hieraus, dass für die Erlösung aus der Macht der Sünde durch Christi Tod die freiwillige Uebernahme und die Unschuld desselben in Verbindung mit der Heiligkeit des damit beschlossenen Lebens von wesentlicher Bedeutung ist", says he in agreement with Sieffert. This should exhort the readers to moral behaviour (cf. vs. 18 εἰδότες); the more specific explanation only comes in vs. 20-21 which return to the idea of vs. 3, as an explanation of Christ. Here, too, lies the answer to the question of why Christ's blood had this effect: because it is the blood of a saviour whose life does not cease with death. It therefore has "dauernde, unvergängliche Bedeutung, durch die Gewissheit, dass er lebt, werden wir zu einer lebenskräftigen Hoffnung wiedergegeben". This refers back to vs. 3 and 13. To Baljon it is not clear how we should regard this event, whether as a declaration of solidarity or otherwise. The author only refers to the innocent, holy, voluntary nature of this death in connection with his ethical purpose, in order to stimulate the readers to live in fear. Wohlenberg seeks the solution in the "blameless" and "stainless" character of Christ, whom nobody has ever accused of sin and who has never succumbed to any temptation. That was why His life could be given in death as a cause of freedom, why it could serve as the ransom which the readers had experienced. Greydanus, however, thinks it impossible that the blood should be precious simply because it has come from a stainless lamb, and gives his interpretation which has already been mentioned in section d. "In redemptione mundi", says Holzmeister, "virtus salvans sanguini Christi tribuitur", as elsewhere in the N.T.: the reason is that Christ sacrifices Himself (Heb.). But Peter provides no scholarly elaboration, he simply records the fact of redemption. According to Hauck the ancient concept of blood and its powers of atonement were clear enough to the first readers and did not raise any problems. If this idea is alien to modern readers we need only think of the eternal truth "dass es nichts Höheres gibt als den wirklichen Einsatz des Lebens und dass solcher Höchsteinsatz auch gewiss nicht ohne Wirkung bleibt". Christ's death is an application of this law: His blood is the symbol of His unreserved sacrifice. That is why He has power over souls. "Durch seine gotttreue Hingabe führt er sie zu einem Bruch mit der Sünde, der es Gott ermöglicht, Gnade walten zu lassen"! With this splendid piece of "Umdeutung" this survey is concluded.

To sum up. By and large we can distinguish between *four types* of explanation in the current state of exegesis:

1. Dalmer, who clearly saw the weakness of the most widely accepted view—the combination of two different types of images—but who has remained alone with his own explanation: “das Blut Christi ist Opferblut, es ist eine Gabe, die Gott dargebracht ist zur Sühnung unserer Sünden, und damit ein Lösegeld, durch das unsere Schuld bezahlt ist. Dadurch sind wir von dem nichtigen Wandel befreit, dem wir verfallen waren, solange wir durch unsere Schuld von Gott geschieden waren und daher nicht unsere Hoffnung auf ihn setzen konnten”.

2. Wohlenberg and Greydanus also take as their starting point the ransom from the paltry power of sin, which is compared to the Egyptian house of bondage. Just as Israel is rescued from it through the Paschal lamb, so the Christians are rescued through the sinlessness of their Lord.

3. Kühl sees in 1 Pet. i 18-19 the explanation of how God became the Father of the Christians: viz. by ransoming them from the Jewish ceremonial service through the obedience and patience of Christ the Suffering Servant. By and large Baljon agrees with this interpretation, although, according to him, the power from which men were rescued was not Judaism but paganism. Van Nes goes in the same direction, but he does not altogether exclude other possible explanations: the author is more eager to provide a moral exhortation than a dogmatic utterance.

4. The most widely accepted view, however, is that of the ransom from paganism in which (and this is characteristic) two metaphors are combined—the sacral manumission of slaves of the Greek world and the O.T. concept of sacrifice. Various themes are intermingled in this O.T. concept.

Knopf based himself primarily on the fact that the author was working with traditional material, which would explain why he no longer *saw* the images. This same interpretation can be found in Windisch, Bigg, Vrede, Brouwer, Holzmeister and Hauck. We also find this view in various monographs on the concept of sacrifice in the N.T. ²³ Thus O. Schmitz ²⁴ writes that this passage constitutes

²³ Thus also P. Feine in his *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*³, Leipzig 1919, p. 509-510; in 1 Pet. iii 18 the idea of the purifying of sins by the sprinkling of blood (see also i 2) connected with i 18; the later doctrine of atonement uniting various different elements is closer than the idea of Mk. x 45. In the background we have Is. lii 3, but with “lamb” the author has Is. liii 7 in mind, with the attribute Lev. xxii 19 ff. That ἄσπιλος should appear nowhere in O.T. sacrificial terminology is irrelevant since it was a word

“das klassische Beispiel für die Verschmelzung der beiden Bilder vom Loskauf und vom Opfer, die in echt volkstümlich ausmalender Weise dadurch besonders wirksam gemacht wird, dass das kostbare Blut Christi so vergänglichen Dingen wie Silber und Gold gegenübergestellt wird”. In the apposition Christ is designated as the Lamb who satisfies all the legal requirements. This may be reminiscent of the Paschal lamb (suggested by the connection of vs. 13 with Ex. xii:11 ²⁵ αἱ ὀσφύες ὑμῶν περιεζωσμέναι at the eating of the Passover; the quotation from Lev. xi 44-45 καὶ ἁγιασθήσεσθε καὶ ἄγιοι ἔσεσθε. ὅτι ἅγιός εἰμι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν twice repeated in vs. 16 and ἐλυτρώθητε in vs. 18). But such an “Einzelausdeutung” will not do, since the terminology does not tally with the LXX.²⁶ The main theme is the ransom whereby the sacrificial blood serves as the price, for “nicht einmal darin braucht man eine leise durchschimmernde Erinnerung an das Passah zu finden, dass hier nicht von der Sündensühne, sondern von der Befreiung aus dem Bann der väterlichen Traditionen im weitesten Sinne die Rede ist”. Although he puts it differently, Wenschkewitz²⁷ too agrees with this interpretation (ransom, price = sacrificial blood, motifs: Paschal lamb, Is. liii 7. The expressions ἄμωμος and ἄσπιλος originally designated cultic virtues, but are here “umgedeutet”. τέλειος and ἄμωμος are equivalent. Cf. Ex. xii 5 and Lev. xxiii 12 ff. The notions have lost their original meaning).

This, then, is a sufficiently complete survey of the present state of exegesis. The views of scholars which are not mentioned are covered by the interpretations that are treated.

taken from the vocabulary of primitive Christianity. One can refer, too, to 1 Cor. vi 20; vii 23; religious liberation is also a moral one.

²⁴ O. Schmitz, *Die Opferanschauungen des spätern Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen 1910, p. 236. F. Büchsel (note 57 f.) also sticks to the exegesis with ransom.

²⁵ Not Lev. xii 11, as Schmitz, *op. cit.*, p. 236, wrongly puts.

²⁶ LXX: πρόβατον instead of ἄμνος; that $\pi\lambda$ is rendered by both words in LXX (cf. Lev. xii 8; Num. xv 11; Deut. xiv 4) does not invalidate this argument, as Spitta claimed, since the author cites the LXX throughout.

²⁷ H. Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*, Angelos-Beiheft 4, Leipzig 1932, p. 160-161. Also Hauck in: Kittel IV, p. 836, seems to share this view. The image of the immaculate sacrificial animal is elevated “aus der rituell-kultischen Sphäre in die rein sittlich-religiöse”, in keeping with the “Gesamtcharakter der nt. lichen Religion”.

IV. *Assessment of the current interpretations*

In the previous chapter I deliberately avoided making any criticisms and limited myself to reproducing the opinions of others. It is better to let those who have won their spurs in the domain of exegesis speak for themselves. It is, of course, immediately evident that there is very little agreement. The commentary of one scholar contradicts the views of another. This shows that the difficulties are noticed and scholars either try to skirt them or seek a combination of possibilities which embraces the elements of truth contributed by their predecessors. In formulating an assessment it will not be necessary to examine each stone of this mosaic of views through a magnifying glass. Certain questions arise in a comparison between the text and the expositions to which no answer—or at least no satisfactory answer—appears. Nowhere do we find an all-embracing explanation. The questions which come up make it superfluous to expend many words on criticism, especially since the forced nature of the current interpretations is often obvious at first reading. What follows, moreover, will inadvertently contain the necessary criticisms.

In the most widely accepted interpretation of 1 Pet. i 18-19 (4) we are dealing with a "*metabasis eis allo genos*". Now, people often take this for granted and base themselves on the use made of various themes of our text as they have been elaborated in later church doctrine. But is this really the only possible approach? Is this deadlock not the result of an erroneous view? Is not the fact that such a "*metabasis*" is assumed proof that no way to interpret the text as it stands is found? Knopf sensed this and came up with something about "*current notions*", but that is little more than a subterfuge. Even the combination of different concepts applicable to the "*lamb*" can only be accepted when there is no other way out.

Wohlenberg and Greydanus make us shudder when we see how many words they require to express their views and what an elaborate content they attribute to some notions. They bring to mind something Professor van Nes once said in a lecture about a certain commentator: "The man uses so many words that we can be sure he doesn't know the answer".

The expositions which we have been considering so far stem on the whole from some preconceived ideas, translations and identifications, for which there *seems* to be some justification, but which, when applied, do not fit convincingly into the whole. This is

particularly clear in the case of Knopf and his repeated comment "we would expect . . .", when we actually find something else. In consequence scholars have long been ransacking their brains to make some sense out of the passage in question. The following points will give an idea of what I mean:

1. λυτρόω is of course translated to mean "ransom". Only Ritschl tried, a long time ago, to translate it as "deliver". He found no support, however, only opposition, so obvious was the idea of ransom in connection with gold and silver. Now, it is certain—and every commentator senses it—that this interpretation cannot be carried through till the end since the term is nowhere connected with sacrifice. Yet people continue to consider "ransom" and "deliver" as alternatives.

2. φθαρτοῖς has been translated by everyone without exception as "perishable things". How could it mean anything else when it has this meaning wherever it appears in the N.T.? But then we would expect "imperishable things" as an antithesis—and this we do not find. Instead we have "precious", not even a superlative as some have secretly tried to make it in their transcriptions. These two terms, "precious" and "imperishable", cannot be equated, although we might wish to equate them and although Bengel blithely did so. Efforts have been made to bring about this identification for, as Kühn says, imperishability must be expressed somewhere in the appositions. Scholars have therefore either used the appositions in vs. 19, or vs. 20-21, from which, moreover, the identification had to be conjured by dint of verboseness. Why "blood" should be more precious than "gold and silver" is not altogether clear—history would tend on occasion to prove the contrary—even if it is the blood of the Messiah. Why this blood has an imperishable force is not clear either. The commentaries, too, show us how all sorts of words can be applied without offering any satisfactory solution. The entire antithesis between 18 and 19 is far from successful.

It is odd that scholars should be so firmly convinced of the meaning of φθαρτοῖς that they rarely even attempt to account for it. Yet wherever else the word φθαρτός appears in the N.T. (1 Cor. i 23; ix 25; xv 53 and 54; 1 Pet. i 23) it means "corruptible". On each occasion, however, it is in contrast to ἀφθαρτος "incorruptible". Our author seems to be acquainted with this antithesis (i 23: οὐκ ἐκ σποράς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου), but does not use it here.

Nor is he unfamiliar with the word ἄφθαρτος, judging from iii 4. This raises the question of whether we can pass rapidly over this point and content ourselves with the current translation.

3. In the explanation of ἀναστροφή everyone immediately speaks of slavery or the power of sin. It is enough to look at the extensive discussions reported in III c. What is odd is that 1 Peter does know the words ἁμαρτία (ii 22, 24; iii 18; iv 1, 8) and δοῦλος (ii 16 of God, but we do not encounter the Pauline antithesis: slave of sin—slave of God), but uses ἀναστροφή, a neutral word meaning “way of life” which gains colour from the appositions (i 15, 18; ii 12; iii 1, 2, 16). That this word was of special significance for 1 Peter emerges from the fact that it appears thirteen times in the N.T., six of which are in this epistle (see also i 17, the verb). Moreover, “futile” and “inherited from the fathers” cannot be equated with “sin” without further ado. Knopf is right in saying that we should expect the name of the master from whose service the slave is released, but we do not find it. Are we not being overhasty in determining the content of the word in this case too?

4. Nor do scholars know exactly what ἄμνος means and to what it refers. There are various possibilities in the O.T., for it has rightly been pointed out that it is there that we must look. Either one of them is chosen and we are then dissatisfied because not everything is covered by it, or we inject it with some element from every possible explanation and are still not satisfied. It cannot be a sin offering because, according to Lev. iv 32, that must be female. The appended adjectives, above all, prove this not to be so: they clearly designate the nature of the lamb but, in one way or another, they must have an ethical significance and express a quality of Christ (how forced this view is appears from the explanations of Greydanus and Hauck in Kittel's Dictionary, where the conversion takes place in a trice).

5. It has already been observed that the apposition involving a simile is in a very odd place in the context (see III e), whereby the genitive link is interrupted. We also speak “automatically” (Wohlenberg) of “the” blood, whereas the article does not appear in the Greek. Is this small addition not an important symptom showing that we really feel something is wrong, as had already been sensed in Antiquity (see II)? Is it impossible to stick to the traditional sequence?

6. Finally, even the link with vs. 17 entails difficulties, as we

saw clearly in III a. For neither the connection with "with fear", nor the combination with "if you invoke as Father etc.", nor the introduction of a "new motif", are satisfactory. The first two possibilities were confuted earlier; the last (Windisch) does not account for the participle construction which, however we look at it, implies some kind of dependence, and not something unconnected.

In studying the exegesis to date we get an ever stronger impression that, frequently though it has been presented, in however many ways it has been illustrated or accepted as self-evident, there is something forced about it. This exegesis is not acceptable unless we have followed every possible line of investigation, and the object of the following pages is to show that this has not been done hitherto, just as some of the questions discussed above have brought to light a few lacunae (this is particularly true in the case of φθαρτός). The root of the evil seems to lie in the fact that if we start with the idea that λυτρόω means "ransom", either consciously or unconsciously we will interpret this passage in 1 Pet. in the light of Paul's words in 1 Cor. vi 20; vii 23, which are constantly quoted as parallels. Now, it is perfectly obvious that 1 Pet. and 1 Cor. use entirely different words. Thus we must first demonstrate that here similar ideas are indeed present. This has not been done since the parallel has been taken for granted, and the exposition of 1 Pet. i 18-19 on this basis is riddled with difficulties. The difficulties appear in every clause of the passage and have a cumulative effect. Even a derivation from Is. lii 3, which seems to have a similarity, is difficult to defend. As Knopf has pointed out Is. lii 3 presents a completely different antithesis from 1 Pet. and we have to go a long way round in order to bring them together (on the one hand δωρεάν, on the other precious blood; we must then argue: in Is. it means "out of mercy" and that is also the idea in 1 Pet.). But are we still practising exegesis?

Finally, the question is: has the author "seen" his images? Can we talk of "Umdeutung" or are we dealing with a true simile? Until we have some evidence to the contrary we would do well to accept the fact that the author knows perfectly well what he is writing about and how he is expressing it. Our objective should be to find the reality behind these words—and we must not be too easily satisfied.

To a greater or lesser degree *all* the attempts at explaining the

text which have come to our notice (and they show the accepted view of contemporary N.T. scholarship) are more or less open to these objections, albeit not always to the same ones. But when we shake the foundations the edifice crumbles. We must therefore look for a solution which can meet these objections.

V. *An attempt at a new explanation*

The only correct method is to treat all the available explanations with the utmost caution and not apply them indiscriminately in an endeavour to make something of them. People appear to forget one thing—the first readers thought in Greek and their minds were attuned to the nuances offered by *that* language. Furthermore, there is always the possibility that a certain image was particularly alive to them because they were acquainted with a reality which has been lost to us, the historical data concerning it being either very scarce or having disappeared completely. We must therefore ask ourselves which possibilities were offered by the Greek language, and we must leave the meaning of the words open for the time being, until an opportunity arises to link one word to another in the same context and form a self-contained whole.

Only when it is not possible to find an interpretation which meets all the objections mentioned in IV, is it advisable to resort to auxiliary constructions like the ones abundantly provided by the commentators. We must also try, then, to interpret this passage in itself, without relying on parallels in other writers which might be no more than apparent. Only when this does not seem possible can we try to find a satisfactory exegesis by taking other writers as our starting point.

I thought it worth mentioning these considerations since the basic truths of the exegetical method often seem to have been forgotten. Of course, I gratefully acknowledge having learnt a great deal from the commentaries I have listed, and I shall be making use of various pieces of information provided by the expositors mentioned in III, although I shall be adopting a very different approach. I shall first examine the clauses of the text analytically (A) and shall then provide a synthesis (B). Although there will frequently be an interplay of elements, these two approaches should be distinguished from each other, albeit not separated.

A

1. There is an old rule which we learnt at school: in translating long sentences we must start with the main clause. In this case we must concentrate on vs. 17 ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε = "conduct yourselves with fear throughout the time of your exile" (R.S.V.). Peter writes to Christians who are πάροιχοι and παρεπίδημοι (ii 11); they are like exiles in this world, a familiar primitive Christian idea.²⁸ I shall later define the concept more closely (see p. 72 ff): suffice it to say for the time being that this is the idea which first appears in the word παροικία. How must they behave in this world, where they are like exiles? That the author was particularly concerned with this ἀναστροφή appears from the frequent use he makes of the word (see IV 3). They must conduct themselves "with fear", cf. also iii 2 ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνὴν ἀναστροφήν ὑμῶν. This word can just mean "fear", "being afraid", as in Rom. viii 15; 1 Jn. iv 18. But it is also the LXX translation of the word central to O.T. piety, the יִרְאָה = fear of the Lord, the true attitude of the pious man towards his God (an idea particularly clear in the Book of Proverbs, but also in Psalms and elsewhere).²⁹ It has the same meaning when used in later Judaism too.³⁰ We see it very clearly in our epistle in ii 17: fear God (a quotation from Prov. xxiv 21), and in many other passages in primitive Christian literature.³¹ An indicative example is 1 Clement xxi 8 (ed. Bihlmeyer, p. 48) on the upbringing of children: let them learn πῶς ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ καλὸς καὶ μέγας καὶ σφύζων πάντας τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ ὁσίως ἀναστρεφόμενους ἐν καθαρᾷ διανοίᾳ. In a primitive Christian text this means: the right relationship to God, dependence, but without anxiety. As long as they are in exile on this earth, this is the way they must live if they "invoke as Father him who judges each one impartially according to his deeds". Although they can speak to the Holy One, the Judge of the living and the dead, as their Father, this does not entitle them to continue in

²⁸ See Heb. xiii 14; 1 Clement inscr., with the important note by J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*², I 2, London 1890, p. 5-6, and Bauer, Sp. 1043 and 1048 resp. παρεπίδημος and πάροιχος.

²⁹ Cf. B. Gemser, *De Spreuken van Salomo* I in: *Tekst en Uitleg*, Groningen 1929 p. 28, and J. Pedersen, *Israel. Its Life and Culture*, Copenhagen-London, 1940, III-IV, p. 624-627.

³⁰ G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*³, Cambridge (Mass) 1932, II, p. 96-98.

³¹ Cf. Bauer, Sp. 1430 s.v. φοβέω 2a, and: Sp. 1431, s.v. φόβος 2 b.a.

their former ways (iv 3-6): they must live in fear, in awe. This expresses their condition as Christians.

Now, it is noteworthy—and it has not been fully appreciated in the exegesis which has been produced so far—that an ἀναστροφή is again mentioned in the subordinate clause in vs. 18. So this is obviously an echo of the one in vs. 17. Whenever a link is established everyone tries to see how this can be the motivation of the “with fear” or of the fathership of God. Now, this way of life is designated as “futile” in vs. 18. Consequently the following parallelism emerges: ἀναστροφή ἐν φόβῳ and ἀναστροφή ματαία. They are delivered from the latter in one way or another (the precise meaning of λυτρόω may be left aside for the time being, but it does contain the idea of “deliver”). They have thus gone over from one to the other. And they are well aware of this (εἰδότες). In the verses 17-18 two kinds of ἀναστροφή are therefore set against each other: a futile one and a Christian one. This is the first datum, and since it comes out of the basic idea of the main clause it is very probably of great significance.

2. What is this ἀναστροφή? ματαία and πατροπαράδοτος. Their way of life had been learnt at home and it was “futile”. Although the last word has nothing to do with idolatry³² there can be no doubt that ἀναστροφή means paganism and that the readers had a pagan period behind them. i 14 ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις and iv:3 ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι are decisive.³³ We thus find that the accepted view of contemporary N.T. Introduction is that the recipients of the epistle were pagan Christians.³⁴ There has therefore been a conversion from paganism to Christianity. But although this paganism is devoid of content there is nothing in the expression

³² On this word see O. Bauernfeind in: Kittel, IV, p. 525-530.

³³ Cf. the commentaries *in loco*. Kühl's exegesis, according to which Jews were being alluded to here too, rests on errors. Amongst the sins in ch. iv we also find εἰδωλολατρεία.

³⁴ See, for example, Th. Zahn, *Einleitung in das N.T.*³, Leipzig 1907, II, p. 7; J. Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the N.T.*³, Edinburgh 1918, p. 328-329; H. Appel, *Einleitung in das N.T.*, Leipzig 1922, p. 105-106; P. Feine-J. Behm, *Einleitung in das N.T.*⁸, Leipzig 1936, p. 237; A. Jülicher-E. Fascher, *Einleitung in das N.T.*⁷, Tübingen 1931, p. 191. An extensive confutation of the views of B. Weiss and Kühl, the only scholars of the last fifty years who regarded the readers as Christians who had once been Jews, is to be found in Knopf's commentary, p. 1-6.

itself which points to hard "Sündenknenschaft" in a general sense. Scholars read that into it. The author of this expression had a very special moment of history in mind. What he means is that they lived first as pagans in a ματαία ἀναστροφή and must now live as Christians in ἀναστροφή ἐν φόβῳ. That much is clear enough for a start. We can hold on to that and I shall go into the meaning in greater detail later (see p. 48 f).

3. We now come to one of the two main points—the antithesis. By which means does the conversion not take place and by which means does it take place? What prevents it and what brings it about? It cannot be denied that in the second part of the antithesis something is said about a lamb which is strongly reminiscent of sacrificial terminology. "Blood" on its own can be submitted to various interpretations, but the apposition which follows immediately (this must not be forgotten!), and which is therefore closely connected to it, reads "of a lamb". The definite article, moreover, is lacking. An exegesis which, knowingly or unknowingly, reads "the" lamb is adding something incorrectly and on the basis of no evidence. To derive this motif from Is. liii, as Kühl wished to do, is particularly dangerous since there is no question of blood in Is. (the *tertium comparationis* in 1 Pet.) but of silence (as much as three times: twice οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα; ἄφωνος), and therefore, if we like, of patience. Furthermore, we can take it that the adjectives are there for some reason. They do *not* suggest "patient suffering": the first, as we know from the O.T., has a cultic-ritual significance whenever it appears in connection with "lamb" or another sacrificial animal. How it has been possible to reinterpret these words is a mystery. Kühl did so because, as we saw, ἄσπιλος does not appear in the sacrificial terminology of the LXX. And since, when it is used elsewhere in primitive Christian literature, it has a moral significance, he interpreted the two adjectives in 1 Peter in the same way. Dalmer and Feine do not regard the first point as an objection (see III d and f). They are right because it is clear that where the word ἄσπιλος means "without stain" the moral meaning can only be a derived one. Moreover, we know since Deissmann that Biblical Greek cannot be artificially isolated and that we cannot accept specific meanings unless they have first been proved to be correct. We must remember that the apposition ὡς ἄμνοῦ ἁμώμου καὶ ἄσπίλου comes first, and that

Christ should be taken as an explanation of these words rather than vice versa. As they stand, they cannot be taken to refer to the nature of Christ without further investigation, but must be regarded as designating the nature of the Lamb.

These words do not appear in the Greek sacrificial cult and terminology. We do indeed read that even there the sacrificial animal must be "von der besten *Beschaffenheit*". "Weder ein krankes noch ein durch irgendeinen Fehler verunstaltetes Tier eignete sich zum Opfer".³⁵ It must be pure,³⁶ but other terms are used to express this, such as καθαρὰ ὁλόκληρα, Plutarch, *de def. orac.* 49: καθαρὸν . . . καὶ ἀσινὲς καὶ ἀδιάφθορον; Pausanias X 35, 7: ἄνευ νόσου; Lucian περὶ θυσιῶν 12: ἐντελής. There is therefore a material similarity with the sacrificial cult of the O.T. But the requisite words are not to be found. We find ἄμωμος, however, in the LXX, the Bible used by 1 Peter.³⁷ It appears there 86 times, 49 of which are in the Pentateuch, all in Lev. and Num. (except for Ex. xxix 1 (twice) and 38), where it is a translation of מוֹם (stain) + a negation (this might have affected the choice of the word) and תָּמִים. This last word is also rendered as τέλειος and also means "morally perfect". It signifies that something really is as it should be, and can be applied in all sorts of domains.³⁸ With reference to a sacrificial animal it means that it satisfies the requirements and is without any physical blemish (various passages are mentioned in III d; Philo too uses it of sacrificial animals, e.g. *de Sacrif. Abel* 51, Cohn-Wendland I p. 222; *de somniis* I 62, C-W III p. 218: καὶ κεῖ θύειν τὰ ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ τὰ σωτήρια καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀμώμους θυσίας ἀνάγειν; *de Agricultura* 130 C-W II p. 121: ἵνα ἄμωμα καὶ ἀσινῇ προσάγῃται τῷ βωμῷ τὰ ἱερεῖα).³⁹

Before giving a clear example of the meaning of ἄμωμος in the LXX I should first say a word about ἁγιωσύνη. It does not appear

³⁵ P. Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*³, München 1920, p. 121 (with a list of references).

³⁶ Th. Wächter, *Reinheitsvorschriften im griechischen Kult* in: *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten* IX 1, Giessen 1910, p. 12-13.

³⁷ See Appel, *op. cit.*, p. 106. Amongst his objections to the authorship of the Apostle Peter we read: "die ausschliessliche Benutzung der 70 und besonders die wiederholt wahrnehmbare unbewusste Anlehnung an dieselben". See also Feine-Behm, *Einleitung*, p. 239 and M. Jones, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*³, London 1934, p. 337.

³⁸ On תָּמִים see the note by J. Pedersen, *l.c.*, I-II, 1926, p. 528.

³⁹ On the use of ἄμωμος see F. Hauck in: *Kittel* IV, p. 836, and Bauer, *Sp.* 79.

in the LXX but in the later "improved" translation by Symmachus,⁴⁰ in Job xv:15, where the LXX reads καθαρός.

Professor Dr B. A. van Groningen was so kind as to tell me that it is a rare word in Greek, which neither appears in association with a cult nor has an ethical meaning in secular usage. It is used of a horse, a stone, a quince or peach, and, metaphorically, about a man: free of danger.⁴¹ It simply means without stain, pure. For the understanding of our text it is important to look at 2 Pet. ii 13 where μῶμος and στίλος appear next to each other (see also Eph. v 27). In the Wisdom of Solomon xv 4 we read of an idol: εἶδος σπιλωθὲν χρώμασι διηλλαγμένοις. See also Jude v. 12 σπιλάδες, a word of uncertain meaning, but explained by Hesychius as μεμιασμένος⁴² Dibelius translates it in 1 Tim. vi 14 as "unbeschädigt". In the ancient world we sense time and time again that the cultic and the moral domains cannot be separated, and that "purity" in both domains is what man needs for community with God. All that is "impure", "stained",⁴³ is unfit for God. ἄσπιλος is thus a good parallel to ἄμωμος. Both adjectives thus mean that the lamb was ritually pure according to the precepts of the Torah: in the first place without blemish, in the second without stain (completely white, for example, as in the Greek precepts. In the O.T. the colour of the sacrificial animal is never mentioned, with the sole exception of Num. xix where we have a red cow. This may be why ἄσπιλος is not to be found in the LXX).

We must now again turn our attention to one passage where the two adjectives also appear together, and in association with sacrifices. It is curious that the passage in question is not mentioned either in the dictionaries or in the commentaries, particularly since it is not tucked away in an obscure corner. In one of the N.T. apocrypha, in the so-called Protevangelium of James, we read that Joachim has separated from his wife Anna because their marriage

⁴⁰ On this translation see M. Noth, *Die Welt des Alten Testaments*, Berlin 1940, p. 214, and E. Nestle in: J. J. Herzog-A. Hauck, *Realencyclopaedie f. prot. Theologie und Kirche*³, Leipzig 1898, III, p. 23. Text in: *Origenis Hexaplae quae supersunt*, ed. F. Field, Oxford 1875, II, p. 29.

⁴¹ Letter, Leiden, 14. X. 1941; cf. Bauer, Sp. 195; ΕΓΚΥΚΛΟΠΑΙΔΙΚΟΝ ΛΕΞΙΚΟΝ Athens 1927, II, s.v. ἄσπιλος of a dress, synonymous with ἄμωμος; and M. Dibelius, *Die Pastoralbriefe*², in: *Handbuch zum N.T.*, Tübingen 1931, p. 55.

⁴² Bauer, Sp. 1269, gives the various views.

⁴³ See R. Meyer-F. Hauck in: Kittel, III, p. 416-434, s.v. καθαρός and F. Hauck in: Kittel, IV, p. 647-650, s.v. μιάνω.

is infertile and he is therefore put to shame before his fellow Israelites. He then hears that his prayer has been granted, for Anna is pregnant, and IV 3 κατέβη Ἰωακεὶμ καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τοὺς ποιμένας αὐτοῦ λέγων· φέρετέ μοι ὧδε δέκα ἀμνάδας ἀσπίλους καὶ ἀμώμους.⁴⁴ Has this expression been borrowed from 1 Pet.? The great English expert on the Apocrypha, M. R. James, said that the author of the Protevangelium was not familiar with Jewish usages and, if we read the book, we must concur with James' verdict.⁴⁵ The author could consequently have borrowed such an expression to give his account a touch of local colour. Yet this assumption does not seem very likely. If he had regarded this expression as an established technical term he would surely have used it in its unaltered form. But that is not what he does, for the word order is changed. Moreover, he does not speak of a male lamb ἀμνός but of a female ἀμνάς (this made no little difference where the sacrifices were concerned: in certain cases the male was prescribed, in others the female). Finally, the context is quite different. Whatever the case may be, it is certain that the author of the Protevangelium knew both adjectives and used them, with good reason, in a cultic, and not in an ethical, sense.

After this long digression about the use of the adjectives we must return to the context in 1 Pet. In the pericope from which our text is taken, the readers are exhorted to "be holy" and the author gives emphasis to the passage by recalling words central to Leviticus "You shall be holy, for I am holy" (xix 2; xi 44; xx 7), see vs. 15-16. Leviticus treats the instructions for the cult of Yahweh extensively. The thought pattern behind these instructions in Lev., a book which in present-day Western Christendom is not very highly rated and consequently little read, was thus not unfamiliar to 1 Pet.: the East has always taken a greater interest in such ritual matters than the West.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ C. Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, Lipsiae 1853, p. 9; there is one reading which omits both adjectives (Fa), another which omits only ἀσπίλους καὶ; instead of ἀπαλούς in the next line "C alique ut videtur" read ἀσπίλους; thus Tischendorf in his critical apparatus

⁴⁵ M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford 1924, p. 38: "In the early chapters the Old Testament is extensively drawn upon and imitated; but the author is not familiar with Jewish life or usages".

⁴⁶ Cf. the report of some Anglican ministers who lived for years amongst the Christians in Persia, the so-called Nestorians: A. J. Maclean-W. H. Browne, *The Catholicos of the East and His People*, London 1892, p. 315: "... the way in which the Mosaic Law is looked on as almost, if not quite,

We should therefore consult Leviticus. The mere transcription of passages, such as we might find in a Concordance, will not get us very far. Since 1 Pet. uses the LXX throughout, it is there that we must look. It is not necessary to discuss many passages: one is enough. But then this one is of such great importance for the entire context of 1 Pet. that we can only wonder why the exegetes did not bring it into discussion sooner. Calvin and P. Feine did indeed mention it *en passant*, but there were no exegetical consequences, probably because the text of the LXX had not been properly studied.⁴⁷

In Lev. xxii 17-25 the requirements of the sacrifice are listed. In view of the importance of the matter I shall reproduce the entire pericope. After the introductory formula we get the following instructions: (18) Ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἢ τῶν νεῶν τῶν προσηλύτων τῶν προσκειμένων πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐν Ἰσραὴλ, ὃς ἂν προσενέγκῃ τὰ δῶρα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν ὁμολογίαν αὐτῶν ἢ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἵρεσιν αὐτῶν, ὅσα ἂν προσενέγκωσιν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα, (19) δεκτὰ ὑμῖν ἄμωμα ἄρσενά ἐκ τῶν βουκολίων καὶ ἐκ τῶν προβάτων καὶ ἐκ τῶν αἰγῶν. (20) πάντα ὅσα ἂν ἔχη μῶμον ἐν αὐτῷ οὐ προσάξουσιν κυρίῳ, διότι οὐ δεκτὸν ἔσται ὑμῖν. (21) καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἂν προσενέγκῃ θυσίαν σωτηρίου τῷ Κυρίῳ διαστείλας εὐχὴν κατὰ αἵρεσιν ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐορταῖς ὑμῶν, ἐκ τῶν βουκολίων ἢ ἐκ τῶν προβάτων, ἄμωμον ἔσται εἰσδεκτόν, πᾶς μῶμος οὐκ ἔσται ἐν αὐτῷ, (22) τυφλὸν ἢ συντετριμμένον ἢ γλωσσότμητον ἢ μυρμηκιῶντα ἢ ψωραγριῶντα ἢ λιχῆνας ἔχοντα, οὐ προσάξουσιν ταῦτα τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ εἰς κάρπωσιν οὐ δώσετε ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῷ κυρίῳ. (23) καὶ μόσχον ἢ πρόβατον ὠτότμητον ἢ κολοβόκερκον σφάγια ποιήσεις αὐτὰ σεαυτῷ, εἰς δὲ εὐχὴν σου οὐ προσδεχθήσεται (24) θλαδίαν καὶ ἐκτεθλιμμένον καὶ ἐκτομίαν καὶ ἀπεσπασμένον οὐ προσάξεις αὐτὰ τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὑμῶν οὐ ποιήσετε. (25) καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς ἀλλογενοῦς οὐ προσοίσετε τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν ἀπὸ πάντων τοῦτων, ὅτι φθαρτὰ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς, μῶμος ἐν αὐτοῖς, οὐ δεχθήσεται ὑμῖν.

δεκτός is a word which occurs again and again in Lev. as the translation of נָחַם, that which is pleasing, acceptable, to God. It appears constantly in the LXX in connection with the sacrificial

in force now. The book of Leviticus will be known thoroughly by those who can hardly pass an examination in Gospel history". The idea of ceremonial purification is consequently very much alive in Eastern Christendom.

⁴⁷ As we saw in III d, other passages are indeed quoted.

cult.⁴⁸ The object of the sacrifice is to be accepted by God; that is how God's pleasure will be obtained. A condition is that no blemish be found in the animal and the list gives us a good idea of the possible blemishes this type of animal might have. The central passage is vs. 21 ἄμωμον ἔσται εἰσδεκτόν, πᾶς μῶμος οὐκ ἔσται ἐν αὐτῷ. In vs. 25, as an alternative to μῶμος, we get φθαρτά. *Here, then, we find it in a cultic context and in the required antithesis.*

We should observe that the LXX has δῶρα, while the Hebrew text speaks of מנחל = bread, food. Thus the LXX makes no distinction but relegates it to the same category as in vs. 18 (for the translation of δῶρον by מנחל see also Lev. xxi 6, 8, 17). Foreigners can also bring the Lord sacrifices, but they are to be subjected to severe control.⁴⁹ In this text the sacrificial gifts of the pagans are judged in the very same way as those of the born Israelites and proselytes.⁵⁰

In Hebrew תַּחֲשֹׁךְ is used, a word which only appears in this passage in the O.T. (derived from the very common verb תַּחַשׁ = to corrupt).⁵¹ For the other derivate תַּחֲשֹׁךְ (Is. lii 14) the LXX gives ἀδοξήσει and for תַּחֲשֹׁךְ (Ez. ix 1) the LXX gives ἐξολεθρεύσεως. We might well wonder whether the word was unknown in this context and whether the subsequent words are an old explanatory gloss, for that is the impression they give (the ms. A LXX omits them).

The word φθαρτός appears again in the LXX in Wisdom of Solomon ix 15; xiv 8; Is. liv 17 (in certain manuscripts; others read σκευαστόν; Swete has the latter in the text, and the former in the apparatus) and 2 Macc. vii 16, but these passages throw no light on the usage in Lev. xxii 25. They admit no translation other than "corruptible", but this is no good for Leviticus. There it can only mean "that which is corrupt, blemished". Only that which is

⁴⁸ See W. Grundmann in: Kittel, II, p. 57-59 and G. Schrenk in: Kittel, II, p. 737-748.

⁴⁹ See B. D. Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien* IV, Giessen 1912, p. 106-107; and W. J. de Wilde, *Leviticus in: Tekst en Uitleg*, Groningen-Batavia 1937, p. 133.

⁵⁰ On the sacrifice for and by pagans in the Temple in Jerusalem see E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*⁴, Leipzig 1907, II, p. 358-362, and Billerbeck, II, p. 549-551 (on p. 550 a discussion with reference to Lev. xxii 18 ff., whereby the גֵּרִים are regarded as proselytes in keeping with later usage. Where the matter that interests us is concerned, however, this treatment casts no new light).

⁵¹ See W. Gesenius-F. Buhl, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das A.T.*¹⁷, Leipzig 1921, p. 820-821, the derivations p. 468.

“whole” can be sacrificed, since it belongs to the divine sphere. All that is corrupt and defective had something ungodly about it in the minds of the ancients.

The translation of φθαρτός by “corrupt, blemished” is strengthened by a variant in the LXX accepted by Rahlfs in his edition⁵² —φθάρματα B²F 8, while Swete’s text rests on the ms. B¹A. This variant reading allows no translation other than the one given, since in Greek words ending in -μα imply the outcome of an action.⁵³ Here, then, it would be: “that which has been produced by corruption”. Even the (often explanatory) Aramaic paraphrased translation, Targum Onkelos, reads at this point תבילתהון = their wound, blemish.⁵⁴ Can φθαρτά mean this? It can indeed, although “corruptible” is more usual (see IV 2 and above for the usage in the N.T. and the LXX). Verbal adjectives ending in -τος can designate: a. the Latin perfect passive participle (in -tus), particularly in Attic, but not exclusively in compound words; b. an adjective in -bilis, fit for.⁵⁵ Judging from the context in Lev. xxii:25 it must be the former: the other gifts are also corruptible since they are consumed in the sacrifice. But an object that already before the sacrifice has something corrupt about it cannot be offered; it is not “pleasing”. All that is ἄμωμος is not φθαρτός.

This is not meant to suggest that the author of 1 Pet. had the texts of Lev. xxii 25 in front of him when he was writing. In Lev. sacrificial animals in general are discussed, not lambs in particular. Furthermore, here πρόβατον is mentioned, and the context is completely different. This linguistic usage from the LXX has been adduced as an explanation because the two words of the antithesis are there found in the same context (of a cult), and that nobody should have found them in the same context before seemed to me to be one of the main weaknesses of the current exposition. Besides, φθαρτά now has a very definite content and is no longer the flat, non-descript “corruptible things”. What we learn incidentally

⁵² A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart 1935, 2 vols.

⁵³ Cf. Winer, *Grammatik*, p. 89; F. Blass-A. Debrunner, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*⁶, Göttingen 1931, § 109, 2: see also R. Kühner-F. Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, I. Theil *Elementar- und Formenlehre*³, Hanover 1892, p. 272.

⁵⁴ On “Onkelos” see M. Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 210-211, and E. Nestle, *op. cit.*, p. 105-107.

⁵⁵ Winer, p. 92; Blass, § 65, 3; Kühner, p. 288-289 (as well as in a school grammar like that of J. van Leeuwen-M. B. Mendes da Costa, *Attische Vormleer*⁹, Leiden 1918, s. 126. So it is hardly a finesse!

from Lev. xxii 25 seems, consequently, to have been a general rule for the author. We should not be at all surprised that this has not come to light earlier in view of our ignorance about many of the details of sacrifices in Antiquity. To various questions which we, for whom the sacrificial cult is not a living reality, might raise, we get no answer. But the text in Lev. xxii is clear enough and makes it possible to interpret $\phi\theta\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ in 1 Pet. i 18 in a cultic sense.

4. So far the result of my investigation is this: the text is about a conversion from the pagan world to Christianity (1 and 2) and something is being said in connection with a sacrifice and its condition. Kühn has already rightly shown that $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\acute{o}\omega$ is not associated with the effect of the sacrifices (III d); they reconcile, make pleasing, but do not redeem. This must not be taken lightly.

The verb actually means "to ransom", as we read everywhere. An indication of the price can be given by the genitive of value, if need be with $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$, as in Is. lii 3, or through $\tau\iota\mu\grave{\eta}\varsigma$ + gen. as in the ransom contracts published by Deissmann.⁵⁶ We find no such thing here, however: here we have a dative. The verb can also mean "to redeem, to deliver" without any religious significance (see, for example, Lk. xxiv 21 of Israel by the Messiah).⁵⁷ This is how Ritschl wanted to translate it, appealing to the LXX. There it is indeed used frequently without there being any question of buying, as, for example, in the case of deliverance from Egypt (Ex. vi 6, in Deut. as a theme). But it is not used exclusively in that sense: it is also used for the deliverance from Babylon, from need and misery (cf. the Psalms). This is also the accepted meaning in late Jewish Rabbinic usage: only once does it there have the force of "to ransom".⁵⁸ Now, it is difficult to claim that Israel was redeemed,

⁵⁶ Deissmann, *Op. cit.*, p. 274-275.

⁵⁷ It would be superfluous to give further references after the comprehensive treatment of the question by O. Procksch-F. Büchsel in: Kittel, IV, p. 329-359. See also Bauer, Sp. 800. It is odd that this scholar should place 1 Pet. i 18 under "to ransom", but for the combination with $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ should refer to 2. 'to free' in a general sense.

⁵⁸ Billerbeck, I, p. 67-70; III, p. 741; IV, p. 860-862. The meaning "to ransom" is so much in the background that Büchsel, *op. cit.*, p. 353, observes that $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\acute{o}\omega$ in N.T. *again* means "ransom" (with reference to Tit. ii 14; 1 Pet. i 18) and continues: "Die Tatsachen sind insofern interessant, als sie zeigen, dass der verwachsene Sprachgebrauch von $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\acute{o}\omega$, der in der LXX zu beobachten war, sofern sie von Gottes Erlösungstaten redet, nun wieder spezieller geworden ist"; Mt. x 45 has indeed proved "sprachumbildend"; he thinks it is wrong to interpret 1 Pet. i 18 in the light of the LXX.

or rather ransomed, from Egypt for, or through, the blood of the Paschal lamb. On the contrary: in the O.T. we read time and time again that Israel was delivered by the powerful hand of God. The eating of the Paschal lamb was an attendant circumstance. Admittedly the blood on the doorpost made the Destroyer pass over the house, but λυτρώω is not used in that context. A sacrifice is also mentioned in the sacral manumission of slaves,⁵⁹ but this did not effect their liberation; it was coupled with the transition from the service of an earthly master to that of the deity. Only when the other terms have been investigated (see p. 49 f) can a definite decision be reached.

5. The question now is: where do we find a sacrifice mentioned in connection with the conversion from one way of life to another? We are dealing with Christians, but never do we find, in the initiation into Christianity, anything that suggests a sacrifice in the most literal sense. Admittedly there was Baptism from the start, and it was later followed by the Eucharist which could indeed be called an offering. But there is never any question of blood being shed. There is only one case of conversion from paganism where this happened: conversion from paganism to Judaism, and the proselyte's sacrifice.

Of the ceremonies which accompanied initiation into Judaism Baptism and Circumcision are the best known and the most discussed. Above all much has been said about the nature of the Baptism (the Thebila) in connection with the origins of Christian Baptism. Yet an offering attended this initiation too. That it is frequently not mentioned is due to the fact that most reports of these usages are from the time after the destruction of the Temple (70 A.D.) when the sacrifices had been abolished. There are a few occasions, however, on which they are mentioned quite clearly.⁶⁰

This, however, is only true if one does not wish to see the difficulties connected with it. C. Anderson Scott, *Christianity according to St Paul*³, Cambridge 1939, p. 27-28 gives λυτρώω the general meaning of "to free", although he believes it possible that "ransom" was also meant in 1 Pet. i 18.

⁵⁹ Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

⁶⁰ E. Schürer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 181-182; Billerbeck, I, p. 107-108; G. F. Moore, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 331-335; III, p. 108-109. J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus Christ, sa Théologie* I, Paris 1934, p. 29, simply reports the fact. Nor does J. Leipoldt, *Die urchristliche Taufe im Lichte der Religionsgeschichte*, Leipzig 1928, mention the offering in his extensive treatment of baptism (p. 1-25).

In the relevant texts we find all the elements necessary for explaining 1 Pet. i 18-19. They run as follows: ⁶¹

Mishna Kerithoth II 1: "Rabbi Elieser ben Jacob sagt, ein Proselyt erlange Sühne erst wenn man für ihn das Blut gesprengt hat, ebenso ein Naziräer hinsichtlich des Weintrinkens, des Haarschneidens und der Verunreinigung".

This tractate (Seder V 7) is about extirpations: such a punishment, mentioned in the Torah, was interpreted as natural death between the ages of twenty and fifty.⁶² The second chapter treats the obligation to offer a sacrifice; the cleansing necessary to eat holy objects (for a man and a woman that have suffered a flux (cf. Lev. xv 2 ff., 25 ff.); a woman after childbirth; a leper, (rendering of the Dutch corrected after Danby's translation of the Mishnah. Oxford 1933, p. 564, ed.). In this context Proselytes and Nazaraeans are also mentioned. The above quotation is directly preceded by a discussion of Num. xv 14: the equal sacrificial duties of a נָזִיר and an Israelite. The former must also bring the burnt offering, just as he must bring the food, bird and shelem offering.

Instead of "erlange Sühne" Billerbeck and Schürer translate: "eine der Sühne Ermangelnder"; Moore: "lacking an expiatory offering".

Goldschmidt comments: a. "Gilt als völliger Israëlit, obgleich er bereits beschnitten ist und ein Tauchbad genommen hat"; b. "Bis zur Darbringung seines Opfers ist ihm dies verboten, obgleich die Dauer des Nazirats bereits verstrichen ist". Billerbeck explains that the Rabbi who made this utterance is probably R. Eleazar the Elder (c. 70 A.D.).

In the Gemara of the Babylonian Talmud Kerithoth 9a (in other editions 81 a) we read as an explanation of the above: "Weshalb lehrt u. die erste Tanna nicht vom Proselyten? Er lehrt nur Fälle, wobei das Essen von Geheilitem erlaubt werden soll, wenn aber der Proselyt ein Opfer bringt, so erfolgt es zur Geeignetmachung seiner Person, in die Gemeinde zu kommen".

This text, which is not in Billerbeck, is significant, amongst other things, as a confutation of Moore's view (p. 331). According to Moore Baptism and Circumcision were sufficient to make the proselyte a full member of the community. The offering was not a condition for entering the Covenant but for taking part in the sacrificial meals. He deduces this from the context in Mishna Kerithoth, for the proselytes were equated with four classes of people whose purification was complete except for the sacrifice. The practical effect was that when the proselyte came to Jerusalem he could not eat of the qodashim. "The offering of a sacrifice, is, thus, not one of the conditions of becoming a proselyte, but only a condition precedent to the exercise of one of the rights which belong to him as a proselyte". But the commentary shows us clearly that there

⁶¹ Translation by L. Goldschmidt, *Der Babylonische Talmud*, XII, Berlin 1936, p. 152.

⁶² H. L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*⁵, München 1921, p. 58.

were different cases. For a proselyte it was a question of being received into the community. See also below.

It is also pointed out that the two pigeons which must be sacrificed (but: "Sie sprechen von einem Vogelpaar nur zu seiner Erleichterung") must both be given as burnt offerings. This is different from other cases in the Torah where a couple of pigeons are sacrificed, one as a sin offering and the other as a burnt offering.

A couple of pigeons were always regarded as the smallest sacrifice: they also came to be known as the "poor offering".⁶³ One could, of course, give more, and this was expected. It was a "burnt offering" (see also below). According to Lev. 1 oxen, sheep, etc. were also fit for this purpose, but they had to be male and תמים (LXX ἄμωμος).

After various digressions we read as follows: "Rabbi sagte: *Wie ihr* (Num. xv 14), wie euere Vorfahren; wie euere Vorfahren in das Bündnis getreten sind nur durch Beschneidung, Untertauchen und Blutbesänftigung, ebenso sollen auch sie in das Bündnis treten durch Beschneidung, Untertauchen und Blutbesänftigung" (Jos. v 5 and Ez. xvi 6 are given as evidence of the circumcision. We then read:) Ebenso durch Blutbesänftigung, denn es heisst: *und er sandte die Jünglinge der Kinder Jisraël* (Ex. xxiv 5; the Thebila is supported by Ex. xxiv 8: "And Moses took the blood and threw it on the people", for there is no sprinkling of blood which is not preceded by Thebila). After that the question is asked: "Demnach sollte man in der Jetztzeit, wo es keine Opfer gibt, keine Proselyten aufnehmen!? R. Aḥa b. Jāqob erwiderte: Es heisst: *wenn unter euch ein Fremdling wohnt etc. oder in eurer Mitte etc.*".

Rabbi is the name of R. Judah Hanasi (b. 135, d. c. 200, exact date unknown), a famous teacher of the law.⁶⁴ The proselytes, therefore, were submitted to the same conditions as the first people of Israel. With reference to Ex. xxiv 8 the texts of Billerbeck and Goldschmidt mention "half of the blood", see vs. 6. Instead of "Blutbesänftigung" Billerbeck translates "gnädige Blutannahme (Opferdarbringung)".

The question at the end is understandable after the destruction of Jerusalem. According to Billerbeck R. Aha lived in Babylonia, c. 300. The text cited is again Num. xv 14. In Billerbeck we also read this remark, essential for our understanding: "Bei Zitierungen wird meist nur der Anfang des Schriftverses gebraucht, auch wenn die eigentlichen Beweisworte an seinem Ende stehen; so auch hier: wie ihr tut, immer wie ihr tut, so auch sie; ihr ohne Opfer, auch sie ohne Opfer".

⁶³ Texts in: Billerbeck, II, p. 123-124, discussion on the basis of Lev. v.

⁶⁴ Strack, *Einleitung*, p. 133 and H. T. de Graaf, *De Joodsche Wetgeleerden van Tiberias*, Groningen 1902, p. 20-24.

This elucidation ends as follows: "Die Rabbanan lehrten: ein Proselyt in der Jetztzeit muss eine Viertel (denar) für sein Geflügelopfer absondern. R. Simon sagte: Bereits hat R. Johanan b. Zakkai abgestimmt und dies aufgehoben, wegen eines Verstosses".

This is a Baraitha, a general name for all teachings of Rabbis who taught before Rabbi and whose traditions were not incorporated by him in his edition of the Mishna.⁶⁵ Billerbeck translates: "Taubenpaar", and explains this as "das vordem als Mindestopfer darzubringen war, Siphra Nu. v 14 § 108 (30b)". R. Simon lived c. 150 A.D.; he refers to the famous Johanan b. Zaccai (c. 80 A.D.) who distinguished himself after the catastrophe of 70 by giving Judaism a new centre and enabling it to recover from a heavy blow.⁶⁶ Billerbeck translates: "Dazu wurde einst Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai autorisiert, aber er hat es wieder abgeschafft wegen der damit verbundenen Versuchung (das Geld als etwas Geheiligt, könnte vom Proselyten für profane Zwecke verbraucht werden)"; parallel in Siphre, loc. cit.

Goldschmidt also notes: "a. Damit er es wenn der Tempel errichtet wird darbringen kann. b. Man könnte das Geld für profane Zwecke verwenden".

As far as the difference in translation is concerned I believe that Billerbeck should be preferred for grammatical reasons.

From these texts we learn the following:

a) Three things were necessary for the proselyte to be considered a full Israelite: *baptism, circumcision and sacrifice*.

b) The discussions presuppose the possibility and the necessity to offer a sacrifice in Jerusalem. This could only happen before the year 70 A.D. After that it could not take place: *it consequently goes back to the time of the N.T.*

c) The purification was only complete when the sacrifice was offered. Before that the proselyte was somebody who yet lacked atonement: the sacrifice is thus the critical point.

d) The essential moment of this particular sacrifice was the *sprinkling of the blood*: this made it "pleasing" (see p. 37 f). It was a burnt offering (as we also see from Ex. xxiv 5).

e) Pigeons were the smallest sacrifice that could be offered. But the proselyte could also bring a perfect male ox or lamb.

f) Money could be put aside for the sacrifice too. It would appear from tradition that this already happened in the days of Johanan b. Zaccai. Now, it is not completely clear whether this

⁶⁵ On the terms Mishna, Gemara and Baraitha see Strack, *Einleitung*, p. 1-3.

⁶⁶ Strack, *Einleitung*, p. 121-122; H. T. de Graaf, *op. cit.*, p. 1. passim.

custom was established after the destruction of the Temple in the hope of rebuilding it soon, or before that time, perhaps for the benefit of people coming from afar. At all events it is certain that this putting aside of money was referred to the offering itself: when there was the possibility of going to the Temple the sacrifice could be offered. Johanan abolished this, however, because it led to abuses, and so the substitution of the sacrifice disappeared. After the destruction of the Temple and the abolition of the duty of substitution nothing remained which was reminiscent of the sacrifice. Baptism and Circumcision alone survived.⁶⁷

g) This was the path, with the sacrifice as the last gate, which the proselyte had to tread in order to enter the community of Israel before the year 70. His admission can be compared to the covenant on Sinai. When the offering is brought the offerer enters the Covenant with the God of Israel.

I observed earlier that the great expert on the theology of Rabbinic Judaism, G. F. Moore, diminished the significance of this sacrifice and, on the basis of the utterances in common use, held that one became a full Israelite by way of two acts: Baptism and Circumcision. The sacrifice was only necessary to participate in the offerings. In my view this is an incorrect interpretation of the texts. The Mishna simply says that a proselyte who has not sacrificed is not a full Israelite, and the analyses and discussions of the Rabbis speak against Moore's view. Rabbi's submitting of the proselytes to the same conditions as the first people of Israel, the distinction between the cases and the question of whether, once the sacrifice had disappeared, any proselytes could actually be made, show clearly that *the sacrifice was an essential element* and, in the eyes of the learned, could not be dispensed with, on pain of not being received into, and thus remaining outside, the Covenant of God.

⁶⁷ See Yebamoth 46 a-b; in b the short rule is repeated twice: a man is not a proselyte before he has been circumcised and has taken the Thebila. In the same tractate 47 b: after he has been immersed and emerges (from the water) he is in every respect like an Israelite. In other cases it was taught that a substitution for the offerings that could no longer be brought existed in the study of the Torah concerning offerings and works of neighbourly love, and later also prayers. See I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*⁸, Frankfurt a.M. 1931, p. 251; Schürer, *op. cit.*, I, p. 652-657; Moore, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 503-506; II, p. 14-15; and Billerbeck, III, p. 123, 152-153, 607; IV, p. 541.

The proselytes' sacrifice is therefore connected with conversion from paganism to Judaism. A sacrifice had to be made which has to be cultically pure (thus: ἄμωμος, not φθαρτός). As a burnt offering it can also be a lamb: in this sacrifice the shedding of blood would be the most important part, used in an absolute sense in the Mishna, called רצאת דמים in the commentary (N.B. there is no article before the last word). When it is not possible to bring the sacrifice some money can be provisionally put aside (although the meaning of this regulation is not completely clear). The sacrifice must, of course, be made in Jerusalem. These are all elements which can be found in the text of 1 Pet. (although a more accommodating interpretation of "gold and silver", which if need be can be explained along these lines, is offered in the following section).

6. One word still has to be discussed: τίμιος. Why is this blood of the proselyte's sacrifice—if this is what is meant—precious? Speculations do not get us very far. In order to understand this the late-Jewish interpretation of Ps. xlix (LXX: xlviii) 8-9 is of some assistance.

The text runs as follows: את לא-פדה יפדה איש לא-יתן לאלהים (8) כפרו (9) ויקר פדיון נפשם וחדל לעולם לטρώσεται ἄνθρωπος; οὐ δώσει τῷ θεῷ ἐξίλασμα αὐτοῦ; (9) καὶ τὴν τιμὴν τῆς λυτρώσεως τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ. The paraphrastic Aramaic translation, the Targum,⁶⁸ says: "Seinen Bruder, der gefangen ist, kann ein Mann nicht loskaufen mit seinem Vermögen, nicht kann er Gott eine Loskaufung für ihn geben. Zu teuer ist seine Loskaufung".⁶⁹

There are two ways in which this text is applied. In *Mekilta Ex.* xxi 30 it is applied to the relationship between God and the pagans: "Für die Völker gibt es keine Loskaufung (Sühne); die Schrift sagt lehrend: Einen Bruder wird sicherlich nicht loskaufen ein Mann u. nicht wird er Gott sein Lösegeld geben: zu teuer ist der Loskauf ihrer Seele Ps. xlix 8 f. Geliebt sind die Israëlitin, denn Gott gibt die Völker der Welt an ihrer Statt hin als Sühne für ihre Seelen". As proof of this last statement there follows Is. xliii 3-4 (saying of R. Ismael, d.c. 135).⁷⁰ It is interesting that פדיון = ransom, should here stand as a parallel to כפרה = atonement.

⁶⁸ On *Targum* see M. Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 209-211 and E. Nestle, *op. cit.*, p. 103-110.

⁶⁹ Billerbeck, I, p. 751.

⁷⁰ Billerbeck, III, p. 82.

The application in *Midrash* Ps. xlii is different. In connection with a description of judgement at the hour of our death we read: "Zwei Welten haben wir gesehen, die Welten der Gerechten u. die Welten der Gottlosen. Ihre Augen haben das Gericht über diejenigen gesehen, die auf ihre Macht u. ihren Reichtum vertrauten, wie es heisst Ps. xlii 7: 'Die auf ihre Macht vertrauen u. der Menge ihres Reichtums sich rühmen'. Was konnten diese in jener Stunde (des Gerichts) tun? Nicht ihr Reichtum stand ihnen bei; und ebenso heisst es Zeph. i 18: 'Auch ihr Silber u. Gold vermag sie nicht zu erretten'.⁷¹ Auch konnte kein Mensch sagen: 'Mein Vater war fromm, siehe, ich werde um seinentwillen errettet werden; mein Bruder war gerecht, er wird mich (dem Gehinnomgericht) entinnen lassen!' Weder Abraham hat Israel errettet, noch Jakob Esau. Ferner heisst es Ps. xlii 8: $\pi\alpha$ niemand vermag loszukaufen'. Was bedeutet $\pi\alpha$? Der Gerechte sagt über jenen Tag, an welchen er seinen Sohn oder seinen Bruder zu Gehinnom verurteilt sieht: Ach $\pi\alpha$, wie schwer ist jener Tag, u. nicht kann man ihn loskaufen! Deshalb heisst es Ps. xlii 8: Ach, niemand vermag loszukaufen. 'Zu teuer ist der Loskauf ihrer Seele' Ps. xlii 9. Sie (die Verurteilten) sprachen vor Gott: Warum ist er zu teuer? Gott sprach zu ihnen: Habe ich euch nicht gesagt: Nehmet (kaufet) mich, solange der Preis niedrig ist? . . . Wenn ihr mir in jener Stunde (da ihr noch am Leben waret) gegeben hättet, dann hätte ich es angenommen, jetzt nehme ich es nicht an; deshalb heisst es: 'Zu teuer ist der Loskauf ihrer Seele'". What follows shows, that according to this exposition, they must go to Gehenna.⁷²

At this point we must keep in mind that, according to the Jews, the pagans could compensate their sins in this world, but were still destined to be damned.⁷³ They and the godless were to have the same fate, for neither of them obeyed the Torah, the sole repository of life and salvation. In both cases the text of Ps. xlii 8-9 is applied: through no man, however pious, through no power of this world, be it gold or silver (this was supported with Zeph. i 18), could they be redeemed, because that costs too much. Here we see the transi-

⁷¹ This passage in the LXX runs: (17 καὶ ἐκθλίψω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους . . . ὅτι τῷ κυρίῳ ἐξήμαρτον) 18 καὶ τὸ ἀργύριον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ χρυσίον αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς κυρίου.

⁷² Billerbeck, IV, p. 1039.

⁷³ On the Jewish attitude to paganism see Billerbeck, III, p. 139-155 and IV p. 353-414.

tion from deliverance to ransom and the other way round: the same word can be used for either term without leading to difficulties.

In section 5 we saw that there was a way by which the pagans could be saved—by becoming proselytes, whereby the sprinkling of blood brought them into the Covenant with the God of Israel and damnation was avoided. This casts light on the usage in 1 Pet. i 19: blood is precious because it can save man from Gehenna.

B

If we look at the text in the light of the data assembled in A § 1-6 it appears possible to give a self-contained explanation. Each clause has a hook by which we can link it to the next.

The readers are exhorted as true Christians to live in fear under a holy God as holy ones. They have passed from paganism to Christianity, from a life that was “futile” and destined to damnation⁷⁴ to the life with God, σωτηρία, salvation. In order to clarify how this passing has taken place the author refers to the great moment of the transition from paganism to Judaism. The proselyte had to bring an offering, a stainless lamb, for example, if he wanted to enjoy in full the rights of the Covenant, and “precious blood” had to be sprinkled, for which no corrupt gift could be brought nor money given since that was not “pleasing to the Lord” and did not redeem from damnation. In such a way did the Christians enter the Covenant with God, but this did not take place through cattle but through Christ himself who once (N.B. the verb in the aorist) let his blood flow in Jerusalem. The readers must know this!

The translation,⁷⁵ then, runs as follows: 17 And if you invoke as Father him who judges each one impartially according to his deeds, conduct yourselves with fear throughout the time of your exile, (18) knowing that it was not with defective (offerings), with silver or gold, that you were delivered from your futile way of life which

⁷⁴ Cf. Eph. iv 17-18 as the best commentary on μάταιος: the pagans live ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν . . . ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν (cf. 1 Pet. i 14) . . . διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας. See also the passage in 4 Ezra viii 119-120 on the fall of Adam who dragged everyone with him: “was hilft es uns . . . dass uns eine unvergängliche Hoffnung verheissen ist, wenn wir so traurig der Eitelkeit verfallen sind?” (H. Gunkel in: E. Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A.T.*, Tübingen 1900, II, p. 377; for the “hope” he refers to 1 Pet. i 3).

⁷⁵ I give this translation since none of the existing ones does justice to the text.

you inherited from your fathers, (19) but with the precious blood of an irreproachable and stainless lamb, of Christ, who etc.

Finally, a few explanatory comments:

From this translation and this interpretation we see that we do not have to resort to exegetical niceties if we leave the words with their own power of expression and keep in mind, on the one hand, the judgement on the pagan world and, on the other, the procedure of proselytism (especially where the offering is concerned). We do not need to ask ourselves how *τίμιος* can actually mean "incorruptible"; to add—"unintentionally"—an article before "blood"; to ponder over the question of why blood is actually more precious than gold or silver, or how this blood can be to the benefit of others.

This settles a great many arguments among the exegetes.

1. There is no point in trying to establish whether *λυτρόω* means "to ransom" (with the emphasis on purchase) or "to redeem". It means both. In Hebrew (Aramaic) and Greek no such distinction is felt to exist between these meanings as in our own language in which two different verbs are used: the stress is always on the deliverance. That is why the word has entailed all sorts of associations. Clear evidence of this can be seen in the exegeses given above of Ps. xlix. Likewise we should note that in Hebrew there is a close connection between "deliver" and "atone" which does not exist in Greek in the LXX and, owing to our own differentiation of terms, can no longer be conveyed.

Anyone acquainted with Semitic argumentation and patterns of thought knows how popular is this manner of reasoning not by way of logical argument but by way of verbal associations. When reading Syriac texts, for example, we are again and again almost reduced to despair by the "slovenly" use of words which often makes such texts untranslatable.

2. The dative, which accompanies the verb, cannot express value and does not even need to do so. This is a perfectly normal *dativus modi* (dative of manner),⁷⁶ or perhaps more correctly, dative of instrument.⁷⁷ In the quotation from Rabbi (p. 42 f) we saw that people entered the covenant (gathered in the covenant) *במילה* etc. thus: through, with, under circumcision etc. We know that this Hebrew *ב* had a considerable influence on the N.T. usage of *ἐν*,

⁷⁶ Winer, *Grammatik*, p. 203; Blass-Debrunner, *Grammatik*, § 198.

⁷⁷ Winer, p. 203 (he had already regarded the dative in 1 Pet. i 18 as such); Blass, § 195.

which is used time after time to express the means whereby, the circumstances whereunder. But we also find adequate examples of the simple dative in the grammars. This last usage is better Greek (in keeping with the style of the author [see 3]).

3. We have been freed of a curious difficulty. It is always said that the author writes such good Greek. So much has this been said that it is often used as an argument against the authorship of the former fisherman from Galilee, the apostle Peter.⁷⁸ But here this good stylist suddenly uses a very clumsy construction—so clumsy that it has to be improved by all sorts of transpositions, etc. Now, however, it appears that the construction is perfectly correct and can be translated word for word. The entire ceremony is based on “blood”. Which blood? Obviously that of an animal which satisfies the legal requirements: that was what those who knew about the procedure of the proselyte’s offering would have expected. But in the case of Christians everything is different: there the blood is “like that of a lamb”, but is in fact that of Christ. The genitive comes as the astonishing explanation, we can almost say as a *deus ex machina*, at the end. This is the great secret of salvation which is revealed.

Moreover, all the terms now seem to have a place and function of their own in the antithesis. We can see how wrong it is to pounce on “gold and silver” and to distort everything else accordingly. φθαρτοῖς and ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ; τιμίῳ αἵματι and ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἁσπίλου now have a definite meaning. Rather than speak of an ill-formed construction we must admit that we have before us rather an ingenious one—a chiasmus: corrupt gifts as against a gift which complies with the requirements; gold and silver, which can never save anyone from death, as against precious blood, which can do so. No other examples of this construction are known in the N.T.

4. The *tertium comparationis* in the simile with ὥς is “blood” (both in 1 Pet. and in the Talmud the article is omitted). For the proselyte it flowed in the Temple, for the Christian on the cross. It is therefore unnecessary to argue about the problem of which lamb was meant (see Kühl’s three questions p. 18), and to think that this undefined lamb was intended as a definite one, or to inter-mingle various different themes. For 1 Pet. and his readers it is

⁷⁸ Cf. Moffatt, *Introduction*, p. 332-333; Appel, *op. cit.*, p. 106; M. Jones, *loc. cit.*, p. 337-338, amongst others: “It has been argued that the Greek of the Epistle is far too good for St Peter”.

perfectly clear: a lamb as a burnt offering. Now, according to Lev. 1 there was a choice of burnt offerings. Why did our author choose the lamb, and not the bull or the pair of pigeons? Only one answer is possible: he could have chosen others, but did not do so because "lamb" was already a well-established Christian expression (Knopf had suggested this, although the true associations were not clear to him). In this context the emphasis is not on the nature of the Lamb as distinguished from other beasts, but on its satisfaction of the legal requirements and on the blood which the lamb sheds just like other legally pure animals.

It is therefore impossible to use this verse as grounds for explaining how the primitive Christians got round to likening their Messiah to a lamb. This cannot be deduced from the Jewish views of the Messiah, but we need only refer to Jn. i 29, 36; xix 36; 1 Cor. v 7; to Rev., where the word appears repeatedly as a definite allusion to Christ, to show that the concept was familiar to the Christians. This might be a veiled reference to the Paschal lamb and to Is. liii 7⁷⁹ but the motifs in 1 Pet. i 19 argue against this.

5. Finally we again come up against the question of whether the author attributed a real power to the blood. Here in 1 Pet. the meaning is that once the "Blutbesänftigung" had taken place the pagan really was received into the Covenant. We must keep in mind that many expositors have exerted themselves in one way or another to make clear *that*, and *how*, the blood had an effect. It appears from the idea in the background, i.e. the proselyte's offering, that this blood belonged to the ritual of transition, and that people were received not *through* the blood's having some magical effect, but *because* it was shed ritually.

Hence it is impossible to tell whether the old concept of blood as the bearer of the power of the soul (the best-known example is Lev. xvii 11, for the soul of the flesh is in the blood)⁸⁰ was still alive and familiar, or whether these acts were performed because they had once been prescribed and owed their effect to that fact.

What effect did the sacrifices have? There is no clear answer to that question. "The sacrificial institutions were an integral part of

⁷⁹ But see J. Jeremias in: Kittel, I, p. 342-345 and Billerbeck, II, p. 367-370.

⁸⁰ G. van der Leeuw, *Phaenomenologie der Religion*, Tübingen 1933, p. 258; J. Pedersen, *loc. cit.*, III-IV, register s.v. *Blood*; J. Behm in: Kittel, I, p. 171-176 (with lit.).

revealed religion, and had the obligation of statutory law", says Moore. Although this law was kept when the cult was still in existence, everything really depended on the heart of the offerer. The sacrificial service ceased in the year 70, but the Jewish religion survived. Why does God want sacrifices to be made to Him who neither eats nor drinks? That is his pleasure, is the answer of the Rabbis. God had once willed it to be so and man must not ask how or why.⁸¹ Whoever has learnt from Moore what great strength the Law (written and unwritten) had as "revealed religion" in later Judaism; whoever knows from Eastern Christianity, for example, how many old usages, whose meaning nobody understands any more, are retained in memory of the way God had prescribed to enter into community with him,⁸² will be more inclined to choose the second, rather than the first alternative: these things were done because God had ordered them. The intended effect came about because God rewards those who keep his commandments (Ps. xix 12).

6. It is now clear why our text has been misunderstood. With the disappearance of the Jewish custom of the proselyte's offering the knowledge of its meaning vanished, and therewith the thread which held the words in the text together. The world of notions from which this text originated was no longer familiar. The entire sacrificial terminology was only known on paper and not as a living reality. Too much significance was therefore attached to ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ and too little to φθαρτοῖς. Scholars tried to re-establish the link in another manner, but this did not work. They then resorted to all sorts of auxiliary constructions and got entangled in the words of the text.

CONCLUSION I: *Peter is therefore speaking, in a context of his own, of the sacrifice once performed by Christ. He does not illustrate it through one of the O.T. sacrifices, but through the proselyte's offering which redeemed the pagan from the curse since it was well-pleasing to God, atoned him, and allowed him to enter the Covenant—not the Covenant of Sinai but the New Covenant, in which one did not live a "futile" life, delivered up to damnation, but in the fear of the Lord.*

⁸¹ See Moore, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 497-506; the quotation is on p. 504. On "revealed religion" see part I of vol. I, p. 219-356.

⁸² Cf. my dissertation, *Nestorian Questions on the Eucharist*, Haarlem, 1937, p. 190-191.

VI. *Further Traces of Proselytism in I Peter*

So far we have reached the surprising conclusion that the proselyte's offering is behind the metaphor in 1 Pet. i 18 and 19. It was as *such* that Christ was sacrificed. Because this has happened we can enter into community with God.

This is surprising because the proselyte's offering is not mentioned anywhere else (in so many words) in the Bible. In the Talmud, as we saw, it is only mentioned once. In consequence it is understandable that this particular solution has never been suggested before, odd though it may be in view of the overwhelming amount of research which has been done on the N.T.

It is also surprising in view of the fact that 1 Peter speaks a language of his own and has a very personal association of idea, as I said in my conclusion. For there is a tendency to regard the author as dependent on the ideas of Paul (1 Cor. vi 20; vii 23). A superficial reading does indeed give this impression, but the history of the exegesis of 1 Pet. i 18-19 shows how catastrophic this opinion has been when preconceived. Peter strikes an individual note when talking of the significance of the one Lord whom all Christians worship. This can also be said of that one N.T. epistle which, more than any other, illustrates the work of Christ with O.T. sacrificial terminology—the epistle to the Hebrews. Although there are similar terms, as we have already seen (compare 1 Pet. i 18-19 with Heb. ix 12-14, and also elsewhere, as in vs. 2 “sprinkling”), the similarity can be explained by the fact that both originated from the the same source, the O.T. sacrificial Torah. But the currents which flow from that source lead in very different directions. In Heb. Christ is compared to the High Priest who effects atonement, something which Christ does by giving Himself as an offering. In 1 Pet. the Christians are compared to the pagans who join the people of the Covenant through the proselyte's offering.

We have reached this conclusion—after establishing that none of the other solutions which have been proposed provides a satisfactory, self-contained explanation—by letting the various clauses of the text speak for themselves. In this way everything is given its due and fits perfectly into the next piece. But we are now left with the question of whether this is a purely incidental simile or not. Does our epistle contain other utterances reminiscent of Proselytism (this is how, for the sake of brevity, I shall designate

everything connected with views concerning the proselytes and their initiation)?

In the existing literature this question has never been taken seriously. Yet an affirmative answer can immediately be given since Billerbeck has already pointed out that the expression "like newborn babes" (ii 2) was also used of proselytes.⁸³ But even in Billerbeck, who has so scrupulously collected everything in Rabbinic literature which can cast any light on the N.T., and to whom every N.T. scholar is therefore so deeply indebted, we find no other indications.⁸⁴ Windisch also noted, in connection with προσέρχεσθαι (ii 3): "vgl. προσήλυτος, also ein Ausdruck der Proselyten- und Neophytenparänese".⁸⁵ but this observation, though correct in itself, has not led to any further conclusion.

We must therefore look on our own, making use of the scattered information about the proselytes which we find in Philo, Josephus, the Rabbis and the pagans who wrote about Judaism. Unfortunately there is no good study on this subject, although the works on later Judaism do contain discussions of the phenomenon.⁸⁶ We neither can, nor should, provide an extensive treatment of the entire phenomenon of proselytism at this point. A comparison with similar expressions in 1 Pet. is all we can aim at. This, however, has turned out to be a fruitful task, and once the eye has got sight of it, it will see many points of similarity. We cannot, of course, interpret the entire epistle from this point of view: this would require nothing less than a commentary. The question here is simply: *does 1 Pet. contain words and groups of words which remind us of Proselytism?*

Such words do indeed exist. In discussing them I shall not go into the expositions to be found in other commentaries since this would occupy too much space, and these commentaries can be consulted by anyone wishing to do so. I shall content myself with

⁸³ Billerbeck, III, p. 763.

⁸⁴ All we find in Billerbeck on i 18 is the information mentioned on p. 14.

⁸⁵ Windisch, *Katholische Briefe*, p. 60. It should be pointed out that Windisch speaks of Neophytes, a mystery term, in the same breath. Windisch looked more in this direction than in that of Judaism.

⁸⁶ Literature on proselytism is to be found in Bauer, Sp. 1192-1193; the article in Kittel has not yet appeared: προσέρχομαι is indeed treated under ἔρχομαι, but not the substantive. The works consulted are mainly those by Schürer III; Moore II; Bonsirven I; Billerbeck, see register s.v.; E. v. Dobschütz in Herzog-Hauck, *op. cit.*, XVI, p. 112-123; A. Bertholet, *Die Stellung der Israeliten und Juden zu den Fremden*, Freiburg i.Br.-Leipzig 1896 (with many texts) is still well worth reading.

advancing new elements towards an explanation. Many difficulties will disappear without trace when the correspondence is established. They will appear to be fictitious problems, the result, and proof, of an erroneous view of the whole (particularly evident in the case of v 12—see below p. 76 f).

In i 18-19 the work of Christ is discussed. It is also discussed elsewhere. Christ's sacrifice was the means by which they could really be brought into the Covenant.

In iii 18 we read of the work of Christ: ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσάγῃ τῷ θεῷ. Although the idea of sacrifice is not present here, as it is in i 18-19, it is more than a Christological commonplace. The last words express clearly the purpose of Christ's death (or suffering, ἔπαθεν according to mss. B, K, L, P, and others). In order to explain this προσάγειν scholars have referred to the Mystery Religions.⁸⁷ If Perdelwitz's view were correct our epistle might have taken its vocabulary from the mysteries, but Perdelwitz's opinion must be rejected since most of the points to which he refers can be explained far better in other ways and many other passages remain unaccounted for—especially those which deal with Israel and draw on the O.T. (see also below, p. 63.67). It would seem more obvious to think of Jewish linguistic usage, where προσάγειν means "to make a proselyte". Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* VII, 3:3 says of the Jews in Antioch: αἰεὶ τε προσαγόμενοι ταῖς θρησκειαῖς πολὺ πλῆθος Ἑλλήνων.⁸⁸ In the Rabbinic texts the pi'el of קרב "bring near" is used for this matter. A clear example is *Mekilta* Ex. xviii 6, in an utterance of R. Eleazar (c. 90): "... auch du, wenn ein Mensch zu dir kommt, um Proselyt zu werden, u. wenn er nur um Gottes willen kommt (therefore without an ulterior motive, for example for a marriage or out of fear), auch du nähre ihm (קרבהו)".⁸⁹ This confirms that ὑμᾶς and not ἡμᾶς, as a number of manuscripts read,⁹⁰ is the correct text. The antithesis implicit in ἅπαξ is related to the fact that not everybody who came to the faith had to bring

⁸⁷ R. Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des I. Petrus* in: *R.V.V.* XI 3, Giessen 1911, p. 86.

⁸⁸ Flavius Josephus is quoted after the edition of S. A. Naber, Lipsiae 1888-1896.

⁸⁹ Billerbeck, III, p. 586-587, in the explanation of Eph. ii 23; he gives more examples. Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 24, n.1, also refers to a statement by Hillel, *Abot* I 12.

⁹⁰ See the critical apparatus in Nestle, *ad loc.*

an offering, as every proselyte had to do, but that Christ had opened the gate to the covenant once and for all. He did this as **קִידִי**, for men who, as pagans, were **ἄδικοι**, for he answered the requirements of the law of God.

If we are here told how men stand before God, the purpose of Christ's death is also indicated in another manner (ii 24 with an echo of Is. liii 4)⁹¹ **ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν**. On being initiated into Judaism all the proselyte's sins were forgiven him;⁹² he was as pure as "a newborn babe" (see below). Similarly through Christ's sacrifice, the Christian is delivered of his sins. But one of the fears of the Rabbis in receiving proselytes was that, after having been freed of their sins, they would return to their former lives—something which did happen, according to Josephus.⁹³ That is why our author says that they who have died to sin (once; aorist, cf. ii 1 **ἀποθέμενοι**) will have to live to righteousness. **Δικαιοσύνη**, the opposite of **ἁμαρτία**, is the fulfilment of the Law of God, consisting mainly in our relationship with our neighbour.⁹⁴ This also emerges from 1 Pet. Here the word has no connection with the relationship with God, as it has in Paul: it is primarily the relationship with our fellow human beings (on the basis of the fundamentally altered relationship with God) which is being treated. See also iii 14 where **δικαιοσύνη** is parallel to **τὸ ἀγαθόν** (cf. also vs 17 **ἀγαθοποιούντες**), an anything but Pauline provision!

What the readers have done corresponds to this **προσάγειν** of Christ. They are **προσερχόμενοι** (ii 3). In itself this means "come nearer",⁹⁵ but Windisch rightly saw that the act of the proselyte was implied, for the word is used in a pregnant sense.

It is not only in the verses which we took as our starting point

⁹¹ On **ξύλον** see W. S. van Leeuwen, *Een zin van den kruisdood in de Synoptische Evangelien*, **ξύλον** and **σταυρός** in: *Nieuwe Theologische Studiën*, 1941, p. 68-81.

⁹² Billerbeck, II, p. 652: a late utterance p. Bikkurim 3.65^c, 61: "Wie man (Gott) dem Proselyten alle seine Sünden vergibt (beim Eintritt im Judentum) . . .".

⁹³ Moore, I, p. 341 (amongst other things the judgement of R. Eleazar shortly after the fall of Jerusalem: "They are prone to fall back into their old ways because they are naturally bad"); cf. Josephus, *c. Apion*. II 123 (many came under our laws) **καὶ τινες μὲν ἐνέμειναν, εἰσὶ δ' οἱ τὴν καρτερίαν οὐχ ὑπομείναντες πάλιν ἀπέστησαν**.

⁹⁴ Moore, II, p. 89, cf. p. 188, n.1. and Billerbeck, *passim*., on this term.

⁹⁵ Bauer, Sp. 1189.

that the author compares the past where the readers have come from to the present where they are now living. He does it here with the words ἐν φόβῳ . . . ἀναστράφητε, and ἀναστροφή ματαία πατροπαράδοτος; but he also designates this as the transition from darkness to light (ii 9) τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὕμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς. If the vocation as such is only characteristic up to a point, the metaphor used is generally regarded as a commonplace: the contrast darkness—light is found in several passages in the N.T. and also has religio-historical parallels.⁹⁶ But the link between ii 9 and 10 is far from being one in which this metaphor is elaborated. Indeed, the words are totally alien to it (people—light—people is the sequence). So, we may think, it is probably either an adopted phrase or an expression which belonged in this context without any importance having been attached to the image. Yet we must beware of precipitous conclusions.

The past is also mentioned in i 14 and iv 3. The situation is characterised as a period of ἄγνοια in the first case, while in the second case we get a clear description: an intemperate life and idolatry.

We should now look at a few passages in Philo about the proselyte (Philo uses various synonyms for this, as we know).⁹⁷ The similarity is so striking that any explanation is superfluous.

De Specialibus Legibus I 51 ff. (*de Monarchia* I 7): all men are equal in Judaism, both those born into it and those converted to it (μεταβάλλεσθαι). Then follows the famous definition: τούτους δὲ καλεῖ προσηλύτους ἀπὸ τοῦ προσεληλυθέναι καινῇ καὶ φιλοθέῳ πολιτείᾳ οἱ μυθικῶν μὲν ἀλογοῦσι πλάσματων, περιέχονται δὲ ἀκραιφνοῦς ἀληθείας. When he ascribes the same rights to all ἐπηλύται as to the native-born he exhorts the latter to honour them with special friendship: ἀπολελοιπότες, φησί, πατρίδα καὶ φίλους καὶ συγγενεῖς δι' ἀρετὴν καὶ ὁσιότητα, they must find some substitute for them τοῖς πρὸς εὐσέβειαν αὐτομολοῦσι, φίλτρον γὰρ ἀνυσιμώτατον καὶ δεσμὸς ἄλυτος εὐνοίας ἐνωτικῆς ἢ τοῦ ἐνὸς θεοῦ τιμῆ. Besides, those who κατεγνωκῶσι τοῦ πατρῷου καὶ προγονικοῦ τύφου must not revile those who still stick to idolatry, lest they in their turn revile Him Who

⁹⁶ W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium*³ in: *Handbuch zum N.T.*, Tübingen 1933, p. 13-15 (with lit.).

⁹⁷ The passages where Philo Judaeus speaks of the Proselytes are well-known and can be found in all the books quoted.—Philo is cited after the edition of Cohn-Wendland, ed. minor, Berolini 1896-1915.—The English text is a summary, the Greek quotations are literal.

truly is (ἀ μὴ θέμις φθέγγωνται): . . . ἀγνοία γὰρ τῆς διαφορᾶς, ἅτε τὸ ψευδὸς ὡς ἀληθὲς προμαθόντες ἐκ παίδων καὶ σύντροφον ἔχοντες, ἐξαμαρτήσονται.

In 54 he adds that they who have apostatized, (not only proselytes but also members of the nation) must be severely punished σκότος αἰρούμενοι πρὸ αὐγοειδεστάτου φωτὸς καὶ τυφλὴν ἀπεργαζόμενοι διάνοιαν ὅξυ καθορᾶν δυναμένην.

These ideas recur constantly. See for example *De spec. leg.* I 309 (*De Sacrificantibus* 10): they have abandoned τὰ πάτρια οἷς ἐνετράφησαν ψευδῶν πλασμάτων γέμοντα καὶ τύφου and have become ἀτυφίας καὶ ἀληθείας ἐρασταὶ γνήσιοι, μετεχώρησαν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, ἰκέται τε καὶ θεραπευταὶ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος ἀξίως ὄντες. The equal rank of proselyte and born Israelite is regarded by Philo and others as the origin of the year of jubilee, so that they who originally had no part in the promised land could settle there (*De spec. leg.* II 118 (*De septenario* 14)). How great the change was for the proselyte who abandoned the polytheism of his fathers is described in these words (*De spec. leg.* IV 178 (*de Iustitia* 6)): ὅτι τοὺς συγγενεῖς οὓς μόνους εἰκὸς ἔχειν συναγωνιστάς, ἐχθροὺς ἀσυμβάτους εἰργάσατο ἑαυτῷ μεταναστὰς εἰς ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς τιμίου τιμὴν ἀπὸ μυθικῶν πλασμάτων καὶ πολυαρχίας, ἀ γονεῖς καὶ πάπποι καὶ πρόγονοι καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀφ' αἵματος τοῦ στείλαμένου τὴν καλὴν ἀποικίαν ταύτην ἐξετίμησαν. An almost identical statement, in slightly different words, can be found in *De Virtutibus* 102-108 (*De Humanitate* 12-13). Here Philo refers above all to the commandment that the born Israelites should love the proselytes not only as friends and as kinsfolk, but as themselves, both in body and soul—in bodily matters in order to further the interests of the community as much as possible, and in mental matters by having the same griefs and joys ὡς ἐν διαιρετοῖς μέρεσιν ἐν εἶναι ζῶον δοκεῖν, ἀρμοζομένης καὶ συμφυεῖς ἀπεργαζομένης τῆς κατ' αὐτὸ κοινωνίας. When foreigners want to be converted they must not be turned away but, according to the law of Deut. xxiii 8 in the third generation καὶ μεταδιδόναι λόγων θείων, οἷς θέμις καὶ τοὺς αὐτόχθονας καὶ εὐπατρίδας ἱεροφαντεῖσθαι. In the same work, 175-179, Philo provides an extensive description in similar terms (*De Paenitentia* I). Here again upbringing in pagan lies is contrasted to the condition of truth. The conversion is named with a term taken from the mysteries: 178 μυσταγωγῶν. The proselytes must be received as the best-loved and closest relatives τὸ μέγιστον εἰς φιλίαν καὶ οἰκειότητα παρασχομένους

θεοφιλές ἦθος and one must rejoice with them, καθάπερ ἂν εἰ καὶ τυφλοὶ πρότερον ὄντες ἀνεβλέψαν ἐκ βαθυτάτου σκότους αὐγοειδέστατον φῶς ἰδόντες. Their virtues are listed at length: σώφρονες, ἐγκρατεῖς, αἰδήμονες, ἡμεροὶ, χρηστοί, φιλόανθρωποι, σεμνοί, δίκαιοι, μεγαλόφρονες, ἀληθείας ἐρασταί (182), the opposite of those who rebel against the holy law. We see how the emphasis here is primarily on the ethical element; this was coupled with their conversion from πολυαρχία to the μοναρχία (179). They now belong to the εὐσεβείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης ζηλωταί; where the first word signifies the relationship with God, the second that with men (175; cf. the use of δικαιοσύνη in 1 Pet., p. 56).

The happiness of the proselyte is exalted, according to *De execrationibus* 152 (6). He is blessed and admired for two reasons τῷ τε αὐτομολῆσαι πρὸς θεὸν καὶ τῷ γέρας λαβεῖν οἰκειότατον τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ τάξιν βεβαίαν, ἣν οὐ θέμις εἰπεῖν; here too he is contrasted to those who rebel and are cast into the depths of Tartarus and profound darkness.

Of the ceremonies which accompany this transition (Philo uses various words for it; cf. Josephus, *Antiquitates* XX, 2, 4 μετατιθέσθαι; Tacitus, *Historiae* V 5: "transgressi in morem eorum") Philo only mentions circumcision (*Fragment on Exodus* xxii 20):⁹⁸ the true proselyte is not the man whose foreskin has been cut but he whose lusts, desires and other passions of the flesh⁹⁹ have been cut away. We cannot, of course, assume from this that the other ceremonies—baptism, offering—did not exist, since other sources prove the contrary. But Philo saw no reason to name them.

From these texts by Philo there appears a clearcut attitude towards the proselyte, constantly repeated in the same terms, as well as a great similarity with the views of 1 Pet.¹⁰⁰

Besides the points I have already mentioned in the foregoing pages I should also refer to the term ἀλήθεια, used repeatedly by Philo to describe the new condition. For the same word is also to be found in 1 Pet. (i 22) ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας. In this passage, however, two more terms appear which need explaining and also belong in this context. The first refers to their attitude to

⁹⁸ This fragment is not included in the edition of Cohn-Wendland; it can be found in Mangey, II, p. 677.

⁹⁹ Cf. what Philo says elsewhere about the circumcision: *De spec. leg.* I 9 (*De circumcisione* 2).

¹⁰⁰ Philo's remarks about the previous state of idolatry also shed light on the "futility" in 1 Pet. i 18.

the "truth"; this consists of ὑπακοή. The same word appears in i 2 (see below) and i 14 τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. It is seldom found in Greek¹⁰¹ and, in the LXX, only appears in 2 Sam. xxii 36 καὶ ἔδωκάς μοι ὑπερασπισμὸν σωτηρίας μου καὶ ἡ ὑπακοή σου ἐπλήθυνέν με. Now, obedience (see also below ἀκοή) is typical of the piety of Israel. The people were bound to satisfy God's commandments, and that constituted their honour.

"Obedience to God's laws", says Moore,¹⁰² is "the supreme *moral* obligation of man, irrespective of the subject matter of the particular article". There is no need to provide evidence of this: every book on the theology of Judaism in this period gives it abundantly. Even the proselyte who, with a few minor exceptions, was fully part of the Jewish nation, was obliged to do this.¹⁰³ At baptism he was made acquainted with the principal weighty and light commandments.¹⁰⁴ That is why *Sifra Lev.* i 2 says that they are proselytes who "have taken the Covenant on themselves".¹⁰⁵ Paul too is in full agreement (Gal. v 3): μαρτύρομαι παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι.

The opening of 1 Pet. should also be discussed in this connection. i 2 κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Concerning this Schrenk remarks: "Hier begegnet schon eine Art Erwählungslehre, auf jeden Fall eine von der grundlegenden ewigen Erwählung ausgehende Gesamtbestimmung des Christenstandes nach Grund, Mittel und Ziel, in trinitarischer Anordnung". πρόγνωσις is "die vorzeitliche Gründung", ἐν "die Vermittlung, die Weihung an Gott", εἰς "das Ziel der Erwählung".¹⁰⁶ Windisch rightly focussed the attention on the strange word order and says: "Primitiv ist die Vorstellung des Geistes". He believes that the fact that ὑπακοή precedes ῥαντισμός is perhaps to be explained by Ex. xxiv 3-8 (we also find this reference in other exegetes). It is hard, however, to detect a close connection between these clauses with a strange

¹⁰¹ See Kittel in: Kittel, I, p. 224-225.

¹⁰² Moore, *loc. cit.*, II, p. 7.

¹⁰³ Billerbeck, III, p. 558; Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 29: "le converti se soumettait à toute la loi juive".—τέκνα τῆς ὑπακοῆς should not therefore be translated as "obedient children" (Ned. Bijbelgen.), but literally, in the Semitic idiom, as "children of the obedience".

¹⁰⁴ Billerbeck, I, p. 110.

¹⁰⁵ Billerbeck, III, p. 743-744; see also Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 80, n. 3.

¹⁰⁶ G. Schrenk in: Kittel, IV, p. 195.

word order. Zahn, in particular, saw the difficulties in linking vs. 1 and 2 "denn was dort gesagt ist, hat nichts mit der angeblichen Zugehörigkeit der Leser zur jüdischen Diaspora zu schaffen, sondern bezieht sich nur auf ihren Christenstand".¹⁰⁷ That is why we read everywhere that the designation in vs. 1 must be understood "spiritually" (see p. 71 f.): then vs. 2 can be explained in the sense given above. There is also some argument about whether behind ὑπακοήν "of Jesus Christ" is to be understood.

By referring to Ex. xxiv Windisch and others were on the right track, but they did not draw the necessary conclusions. Zahn's remark that vs. 2 refers to the state of the Christians was also partially correct, but he had no eye for the peculiarity of the Christian state of *these* readers.

1 Pet. is addressed to the ἐκλεκτοί, exiles of the Dispersion. Vs. 2 must then be seen as an explanation of this "chosen". It is a fundamental idea, both of the O.T. and later Judaism, that God chose Israel from the peoples of the earth. See, for example, Deut. vii 6 ὅτι λαὸς ἅγιος εἶ κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου, καὶ σὲ προεῖλατο κύριος ὁ θεός σου, εἶναι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ὅσα ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς. Kohler said that this election is "the central point of Jewish theology and the key to the understanding of the nature of Judaism".¹⁰⁸ Israel's election appeared in the Lawgiving, as is clearly stated in *Exodus Rabba* 30: "Er tut seine Worte Jakob kund, seine Satzungen und Rechte Israel; so hat er es keinem (anderen) Volk getan (Ps. cxlvii 9 f.); aber wem (hat er also getan)? Jakob, den er von allen Völkern erwählt hat".¹⁰⁹

1 Pet. speaks of this fundamental election. All these words can be traced back to the events on the Sinai. Πρόγωσις is often associated with the eternal election. Now, the verb also appears in i 20 with the addition "before the foundation of the world". The closer qualification indeed shows that *this* notion of the eternity of the election was *not* contained in the verb itself. We only find it elsewhere in the N.T., in Rom. viii 29 (where the sense is arguable) and

¹⁰⁷ Th. Zahn, *Einleitung*, II, p. 13.

¹⁰⁸ Kohler, *Jewish Theology*, p. 223, quoted by Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 73; Bonsirven deals with Israel's election on p. 73-98.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 81: "le don de la Tôrâ à Israel est une des preuves manifestes et le signe permanent du choix divin"; see also Billerbeck, *passim*; W. Sanday-A. C. Headlam, *Romans*⁵ in: *International Critical Commentary*, Edinburgh 1902, p. 248-249; Quell-G. Schrenk in: Kittel, IV, p. 147-197.

in xi 2, where it is again used in connection with the people. For, in treating the question of whether God renounced his people, Paul exclaims: οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω. Γινώσκω is used in the sense of "to choose";¹¹⁰ the προ- in this context should not be applied to time but should be taken to mean *above all other things, e.g. the peoples of the world*. Cf. the use of προ- in Deut. vii 6 (that is why an additional phrase describing the time is necessary in i 20).¹¹¹

Besides the election by God we read of the "sanctification" of the people before they can receive the Law: Ex. xix 10 the order ἄγνισον αὐτοὺς σήμερον καὶ αὔριον and vs. 14, the enforcement by Moses. They subsequently received the Law in this state, described thus in Ex. xxiv 3 ff.: εἰσῆλθεν δὲ Μωυσῆς καὶ διηγήσατο τῷ λαῷ πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα· ἀπεκρίθη δὲ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς φωνῇ μιᾷ λέγοντες· Πάντας τοὺς λόγους οὓς ἐλάλησεν κύριος ποιήσομεν καὶ ἀκουσόμεθα. (4) Moses gives the words of the Lord; later he builds an altar with twelve stones for the twelve tribes of Israel. (5) καὶ ἐξάπέστειλεν τοὺς νεανίσκους τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἀνήνεγκαν ὀλοκαυτώματα, καὶ ἔθυσαν θυσίαν σωτηρίου τῷ θεῷ μυσχάρια. (6) Moses pours half the blood into basins and sprinkles the other half on the altar. (7) καὶ λαβὼν τὸ βιβλίον τῆς διαθήκης ἀνέγνω εἰς τὰ ὄτα τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ εἶπαν· Πάντα ὅσα ἐλάλησεν Κύριος ποιήσομεν καὶ ἀκουσόμεθα (8) λαβὼν δὲ Μωυσῆς τὸ αἷμα κατεσχέδασεν τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ εἶπεν. Ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο Κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων τῶν λόγων τούτων.

Here we find the "obedience" and the "sprinkling of the blood". The words have been chosen independently, but the content is similar. It is better not to read commas, as in Nestle's text of 1 Pet. i 2, but a consecutive sentence. At this point we must remember that *these very words from Ex. xxiv are used as evidence of the proselyte's offering in Rabbinic theology* (see p. 43) and that Rabbi was convinced that *the proselytes were received in God's Covenant in the same way as Israel was of old*.

In this way alone do the words in 1 Pet. have a close and perfectly clear link: Israel's election is also the glory of the proselytes. Now everything is in the right place and we do not need to insert any surprising ideas or to make ὑπακοή dependent on Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: it must be taken absolutely. We should notice the contradistinction

¹¹⁰ See R. Bultmann in: Kittel, I, p. 715-716.

¹¹¹ This use of προ- is common in Greek, as any Greek dictionary will show.

here: through God's election Israel has become His "chosen" people, has been sanctified by Moses, has promised obedience and has been sprinkled in the covenant with the blood of a burnt animal offering: *so too are the proselytes*. But where these "chosen people" are concerned things are different. Through God's election, but also through the sanctification of the Spirit, they have committed themselves to obedience, and are sprinkled with the blood of Christ.

The sprinkling of the blood is also mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix 13, 19, 21; x 22; xii 24), but here too it appears that 1 Pet. has a distinct tone of his own, provided, that is, that we understand his words correctly.¹¹²

At the same time we see that in this case it is impossible that the "sprinkling of the blood" should have been taken from the mystery religions, as Perdelwitz claimed,¹¹³ since this would not explain the other term.

Finally, in connection with what follows, it should also be pointed out that this opening fits perfectly into the ideas developed in the rest of the epistle. This makes the attempts of Harnack¹¹⁴ and others to isolate the opening from the body of the work a misconception (aside from other objections which can be made to their hypotheses).

If we assume 'admission into the covenant' to be read both in i 2 and i 18-19, the terminology used tallies perfectly with that in ii 9. We already saw that the end of this verse was similar to what Philo says of the proselyte (see p. 58 f). The beginning runs: *ὁμοῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ κτλ.* These expressions, as we know, are titles of honour of the "chosen people of the Covenant". For in Ex. xix 5-6 = Ex. xxiii 22 LXX we read of the people receiving the Law *ἐὰν ἀκοῇ ἀκούσητε τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς, καὶ ποιήσης πάντα ὅσα ἂν ἐντείλωμαί σοι, καὶ φυλάξῃτε τὴν διαθήκην μου, ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιού-*

¹¹² W. Bornemann in his article quoted in note 159 says (p. 144): "dass einzige was einigermaßen zum Inhalt des Schriftstücks passt, ist die Formel 1, 2 . . . Der Ausdruck *ἐκλεκτός* entspricht freilich mehr den Wendungen des Hebräerbriefes als des 1 Pt.". Here, however, the context is viewed incorrectly.

¹¹³ R. Perdelwitz, *op. cit.*, p. 97-98 (he has the Attis mysteries, in particular, in mind).

¹¹⁴ A. Harnack, *Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur*, Leipzig 1897, I, p. 451-465.

σιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν. ἐμὴ γὰρ ἐστὶν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ. ὁμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον. The idea that Israel was a nation "belonging" to God can be found throughout later Jewish literature.¹¹⁵ In Is. xliii 20-21 we read that God gave water in the wilderness to ποτίσαι τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν, λαόν μου ὃν περιποιησάμην τὰς ἀρετάς μου διηγεῖσθαι. The readers belong to that nation. In this context, too, we encounter the same idea of "obedience". It is therefore clear why the author can say in ii 10: οἷ ποτε οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαός θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἡλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες (drawing on Hosea). Here too the contrast between "before" and "now" appears. They have experienced God's mercy (i 3)¹¹⁶ and they, who once did not belong to the nation, have now joined as proselytes, in the same manner as Israel did before them.

Seen in the light of what I have quoted from Ex. xix 10 the "having purified" of 1 Pet. i 22 becomes clear too. That is why they must be ἅγιοι, as part of the holy people (i 16, cf. Lev. xix 2, p. 37 f), for "Israel ist heiliger Same . . . An dieser Heiligkeit πᾶσι nimmt der Proselyt teil, sobald er zum Judentum übergetreten ist".¹¹⁷

We should now turn our attention to a few other expressions. In iii 9 we read that the Christians are called ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε. Curiously enough this expression appears again in the N.T., in Heb. xii:17, with reference to Esau. Here it is very naturally used in connection with the blessing of Isaac in Gen. xxviii. The author warns his readers not to be like Esau, but to inherit the blessing. Then there follows a passage which contains the verb προσέρχομαι as the main word, recalling the Lawgiving of Sinai. There the blessing is obtained for Israel because Israel came to eternal blessedness by keeping the Law,¹¹⁸ while the Christians have come to a different mountain. The similarity in different contexts is

¹¹⁵ Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 81.

¹¹⁶ Billerbeck (I, p. 646) quotes a late Rabbinic tradition, the Pirke R. Eliezer, according to which Ps cxviii 4 "Let those who fear the Lord say, His steadfast love endures for ever" was recited by the proselytes (the cause is clear: the "godfearers").

¹¹⁷ Billerbeck, III, p. 374.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 90: "Israel a reçu la Loi, il l'étudie et la garde: voilà son grand mérite". See also p. 90-92. See also the important pages in Moore, *loc. cit.*, II, p. 90-95; through God's free election Israel has become the nation of His Law: by keeping the Law they are rewarded with "a lot in the World to Come".

very remarkable.¹¹⁹ It can be explained by the fact that both concepts rest on the conviction that *the proselytes also possessed the promises made to their fathers*, and that they could inherit the blessing. Cf. what Philo says in *De exsecrationibus* 152 (see above p. 59) about the glorious prospect in store for the proselyte, and see also 1 Pet. i 4.

In iii 13 the Christians are described as τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταί. According to Stumpff this usage is "völlig griechisch", "ein fortgesetztes eifriges Ausrichten des Handelns auf sittliche Ideale".¹²⁰ Where ζηλωτής appears in the N.T., however, it means a "zealot for the Law of the Lord" (Acts xxi 20; xxii 3; Gal. i 14). A strong similarity to this passage can be found in Tit. ii 14, a text the tone of which is very reminiscent of our epistle.¹²¹ Jesus Christ ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθάρσις ἑαυτῶ λαὸν περιούσιον, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων (here again we encounter the expression "a people of (God's) own"; λυτρώω, too, is in keeping with 1 Pet. i 18). The word ζηλωτής is also used of the proselytes who, like the born Jews, were "zealots". Philo uses it in this sense (*De Paenitentia* 1, see p. 58 f), and it appears to be an established term. Josephus says, in connection with the famous case of king Izates, the princely convert from Adiabene, in *Antiquitates* XX 2, 5: ζηλοῦν τὰ πάτρια τῶν Ἰουδαίων is better than circumcision. He refers to the influence of Jewish propaganda with these words (*c. Apion.* II 39): καὶ πλήθεσιν ἤδη πολλὸς ζῆλος γέγονεν ἐκ μακροῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐσεβείας (the same word, εὐσέβεια, used by Philo). Even outsiders observe this "zeal", according to Dio Cassius XXXVII 17. He explains that he does not know how they came by the name of Jews: φέρει δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους ὅσοι τὰ νόμιμα αὐτῶν καίπερ ἄλλοεθνεῖς ὄντες ζηλοῦσι,¹²² and the subjects of Izates chide their prince as ἄνδρα τῶν παρ' ἐτέροις ζηλωτὴν ἐθῶν (*Antiq.* XX 2, 5).¹²³ Good works are δικαιοσύνη (see p. 56) in the context of 1 Pet.; as also in Philo (p. 59). Above all

¹¹⁹ Within the framework of this study it is not possible to go into the question of whether there are more allusions to Proselytism in Hebrews: it is perfectly likely.

¹²⁰ A. Stumpff, in: Kittel, II, p. 889-890.

¹²¹ There are other points of community between Titus and 1 Pet. (see Moffatt, *Introduction*, p. 321). I hope to be able to discuss the relationship between these two epistles in greater detail elsewhere.

¹²² In Schürer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 167, n. 51.

¹²³ On ζηλωτής see also Bauer, Sp. 563.

they are the moral precepts of the Torah. In this connection we can also refer to the exhortation to "brotherly love" (i 22; ii 17; iv 8). Christianity is named an ἀδελφότης.¹²⁴ The proselytes were naturally obliged to observe this. According to Philo (*De Paenitentia* I) they brought "that which above all leads up to friendship, the θεοφιλέσ ἡθος" (p. 58 f). In almost all statements of the Alexandrian philosopher about the proselytes it is pointed out that the people of Israel had to accept them with love, not only as relatives but as themselves (1 Pet. iv 8 τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ). For the people of Israel were obliged to observe the commandment to love their neighbour by Lev. xix 18, a verse which can be interpreted as love for the members of the nation and for the proselytes.¹²⁵ According to various witnesses many pagans were particularly annoyed by this. Bonsirven says it was a common complaint against Judaism that "ils gardaient entre eux un esprit d'étroite solidarité".¹²⁶ The words of Juvenal are famous:

non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti
quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.¹²⁷

In iv 7 we read the admonition σωφρονήσατε; this is the first virtue which Philo (p. 59) values in the proselyte.

In iv 12-13 the author says that the readers must not find it strange if they experience πύρωσις πρὸς πειρασμόν, because this attends community with Christ. It is also said of community with Judaism. According to *Yebamoth* 47 a someone who is going to become a proselyte is asked what reasons he has for doing so. "Weiss du nicht, dass die Israeliten in dieser Zeit bekümmert, bedrängt, gestossen und zerschlagen sind, und dass Leiden über sie kommen?" When he says that he knows this but is not worthy (the interpretation of the passage is not clear: *Tr. Gerim.* i, to put my neck beneath the yoke of Him who spoke and the world was created; *Rashi*, to take part in their suffering), he must be received at once.¹²⁸

¹²⁴ A word which only appears in 1 Macc. xii 10, 17 in the LXX, meaning "league". It was a normal Hellenistic term designating a "Kultgenossenschaft".

¹²⁵ Billerbeck, I, p. 355-357.

¹²⁶ Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, p. 5; he refers to the texts in Th. Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, Paris 1895, p. 14, 99, 167, 195, 266, 297.

¹²⁷ In Schürer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 154, n. 17.

¹²⁸ Billerbeck, I, p. 110.

The suffering of the proselytes in particular is discussed in the same tractate, *Yebamoth* 48b: "Bar. R. Chananja b. Gamaliël (um 120) sagte: "Weshalb sind die Pr. in dieser (gegenwärtigen) Zeit gedrückt u. kommen Leiden über sie?"¹²⁹ The various answers given to this question are of no interest to 1 Pet., but it remains a fact that people asked why the proselytes were being persecuted.

In i 3 and 22 the conversion was alluded to in the act of ἀναγεννᾶν. Windisch said that this idea could not be derived from Judaism but must be explained from the mystery religions. In his already quoted work Perdelwitz did so very extensively (p. 37-55). This in itself is not wrong. Philo too elucidated the "initiation" into Judaism for the pagans with terms taken from the mysteries (p. 58): that was the obvious thing to do. But it does not mean, as Perdelwitz tried to prove, that all 1 Peter's metaphors are taken from the mystery religions. On the contrary; both the principal ideas and the features discussed in this chapter are of such a nature that we are made to think of proselytism (a passage like i 18-19 is impossible to elucidate otherwise). Now, the concept of "rebirth" is not to be found in Judaism (indeed, it is very rare throughout the N.T.). But we do find the expression also used in our epistle ii 2 ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη. The proselyte too was regarded as a "newborn babe". With Circumcision and Baptism all that has gone before falls away; his former transgressions no longer matter. The same expression can be applied to the way of life, for example in connection with the inheritance of children born before or after the conversion. It is also said of others who enter a new sphere of life.¹³⁰ Here, too, we read of the breaking of the bonds of sin from the past: ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑποκρίσεις καὶ φθόνους καὶ πᾶσας καταλαλιὰς.¹³¹ This is reminiscent of the list of the virtues of the proselytes given by Philo (*De Paenitentia* 2 cf. p. 58 f). Compare, too, the Rabbinic comment in *Numeri R.* 8 on 1 Sam. ii 30: "(Die Schrift redet) von den Proselyten: diese ehren Gott, indem sie ihre bösen Werke lassen u. kommen u. unter die Flügel der Schekhina fliehen"¹³² (this last expression is often used about the act of the

¹²⁹ Billerbeck, I, p. 929.

¹³⁰ On "newborn babes" see Billerbeck, II, p. 423 and Moore, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 335; III, p. 110.

¹³¹ ἀποθέμενος (see p. 56) should not be translated as "put away . . . and" as in the translation of the N.B.G. and the R.S.V., but as "having put away" or "since you have put away etc.".

¹³² Billerbeck, III, p. 619.

proselyte and is taken from Ruth iii 9). In the Rabbinic tradition Shekhina is a circumlocutory designation of God, lit. "the dwelling".¹³³ For baptism is not *σαρκὸς ἀπόθεςις ῥύπου*, but *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα* iii 21. This much is clear, whatever the exact meaning of the words may be.¹³⁴

Apart from the sacrifice in i 18-19 baptism is also mentioned here which was also demanded of the proselyte (see p. 41 ff.). It "saves", for it contributes to bringing the proselyte out of "lies" into the "truth" (Philo), out of the curse into blessedness (see p. 64 f.). For the Rabbis, too, mankind before the flood was a paragon of sinfulness, but the flood radically removed all the sins and sinners.¹³⁵ The image can consequently be well understood from this association of ideas, although, as far as I know, we do not encounter the comparison of the proselyte's baptism with the flood.

To sum up the results of this study so far. We see that in our epistle there are fifteen points at which we find traces reminiscent of proselytism. Not all these passages contain clear references to proselytism, however. Some, such as the one about "zealots, neighbourly love and the strangeness of the persecutions", would be slender evidence *on their own*,¹³⁶ but, when they are seen in connection with other passages, the similarity to what is said about the proselytes becomes striking. They consequently strengthen my thesis, for texts like i 18-19, ii 9 and iii 18 allow of no other interpretation and are conclusive.

These passages, which show parallels with proselytism, are not to be found in a single chapter but throughout the epistle. The similarities appear constantly *wherever the situation of the addressees of the epistle is being treated* and wherever the work of Jesus Christ and its significance is discussed.

It is now necessary that these data, which have not hitherto been properly appreciated, be applied to a discussion of the addressees of the epistle and the author's objective.

¹³³ Cf. Billerbeck, IV, Register, s.v. Flügel, and II, p. 314-315.

¹³⁴ See H. Greeven in: Kittel, II, p. 686.

¹³⁵ On the generation of the flood in Rabbinic literature see Billerbeck, I, p. 961-966.

¹³⁶ This is not counting iii 6 ὡς Σάρρα, the mother of the people of the Covenant, as an example for women, or ii 11, although we find words there which are used in Rabbinic literature about Abraham as a proselyte (see p. 72). This would bring the number to 17.

VII. *The problem of 1 Peter: addressees and objective of the epistle*

In his excellent introduction to the New Testament Moffatt wrote: "Any theory of the writing thus turns out to involve a fairly speculative reconstruction of the historical data requisite for its setting".¹³⁷ This verdict was based on a study and survey of the extensive literature on the subject and the attempts to answer the questions: who was the author, why did he write, when and to whom was he speaking?

Even when we know what has been written on these problems since 1918 we must subscribe to Moffatt's judgement. There is no clear item of evidence which affords us a firm grip on the matter. Scholars have been content with general considerations. Before 1918 there was a tendency to seek support in the statements referring to the "persecution" in chap. iv. According to whether one saw the apostle Peter as the author of the epistle or not, it was dated either in the years of the persecution under Nero (64) or under Domitian, not to say under Trajan. The address was seen as symbolic; the Christians as the true people of God on earth in the Dispersion. They were descended from the pagans and not, as had been generally assumed earlier and as Kühl and Weiss claimed in later years, from the Jews. The objective was to console the readers at a time when persecution was a tough test of their faith. It was difficult, however, to fit in the many specific exhortations. Some scholars (Perdelwitz, Bornemann, Windisch and, partly, Hauck) saw the epistle as a sermon on the occasion of a Baptism. A strong dependence on the Pauline epistles was observed. Things which one might have expected in an epistle from Peter were not to be found (discussion of the Law, references to the life of Jesus [v 1 was regarded as insufficient], the Greek was too good, etc.). The whole tone of the epistle was regarded as that of a Paulinist. Furthermore, according to Windisch, Peter would not have been writing about the Jews, as he did in ii 8-9, for the Jews were thereby excluded from the covenant. In consequence scholars either decided that the epistle was not authentic—that Peter had no hand in it—or that it was written by Silvanus, a companion of Paul, at Peter's request (cf. 1 Pet. v 12). The mysterious words in v 13 were usually taken as evidence that the epistle was written from Rome (Rome was Babylon for the primitive Christians, cf. Rev. xvii).

¹³⁷ Moffatt, *Introduction*, p. 344. For other books on the Introduction, see note 34.

This is a broad outline of the state of N.T. introduction studies to date. Of course, certain correct insights were applied here too. But, on the basis of the data provided in chapters V and VI, it is now possible to reach more decisive conclusions which will radically alter the questions of N.T. introduction and the attitude to the epistle as a whole.

I will not burden my treatment with extensive confutations of divergent opinions in this case either. I wish to make a positive contribution to the interpretation of the epistle. Thanks to evidence which has been neglected hitherto we no longer have to work on the basis of generalisations and speculations, but can now provide concrete data which make it possible to find the required "historical setting".

My starting point was the exegesis of i 18-19. It has not hitherto been observed that the decisive element for the *dating* of the work lies here. This passage was a statement about the work of Christ, and we have noted that the words only make sense when we see the proselyte's offering as their background. Just as the proselytes joined the covenant people through a decisive sacrifice, so the formerly pagan readers joined the covenant through the sacrifice of Christ. This comparison only made sense at a time when the proselyte's offering was still being practised and when men were convinced that they could only join God's covenant in this way. For the author wants to make it clear that the offering *has been* brought, and the readers "know" this. He is dealing with that living reality. When this way of joining the nation of the covenant had disappeared (as it did after 70 A.D.) the force of such argumentation would have vanished: a reference to Baptism would have been quite sufficient.¹³⁸

There can therefore be no doubt about the period to which this leads us: it must be *before the year 70* (see p. 44). This renders any view of the epistle which dates it at the end of the first, or the beginning of the second, century automatically invalid. However

¹³⁸ The argument that this could be valid "spiritually" even after 70, as in the case of the use of the Law in Heb., is no good since this argument only gains force in connection with the others for an earlier dating. Everything can be accounted for before 70 provided we do not let constructions of our own take precedence of the facts. We must also keep in mind the difference between Heb., which presents Jesus as the fulfilment of the O.T. sacrificial cult, and 1 Pet. who wants to persuade his readers of the reality of their entry into the covenant of God. See also p. 44 ff.

we look at it, i 18-19 keeps us before 70. Theories which, by means of general considerations, lead to another solution thereby become unreal. The attractive part of this unimpeachable evidence is that, although it is obviously noticeable, it has not been advanced intentionally. It comes, as it were, as an unobtrusive surprise which may be of great significance for other research into the N.T.

In which circles must we look for the readers? The address in i 1 is quite straightforward, provided, that is, that it is not set in the wrong context and that we do not bar our way a priori by making a small insertion. It is directed to *παρεπίδημοις διασπορᾶς*. Feine¹³⁹ observed that these people had a pagan past (see p. 32 f.); but there were indeed some Jewish Christians in Southern Galatia (Acts xiv). "Da sich der Brief an Heidenchristen wendet, so sind die *ausgewählten Beisassen der Diaspora* in den genannten Gebieten uneigentlich zu verstehen. Gedacht ist an die Christen als Glieder des wahren Gottesvolkes, die als Fremdlinge auf der Erde zerstreut wohnen, da ihre wahre Heimat im Himmel ist, vgl. Gal. vi 16; Phil. iii 20; Heb. xiii 14, auch 1 Pet. i 17; ii 11". According to Appel¹⁴⁰ the readers are not sojourners in a constitutional sense, but here on earth "überhaupt"; the diaspora can be understood of the Jews and with *παρεπίδημοι* refer to people "die als Glieder der jüdischen Diaspora von Pontus usw. ausgewählte Beisassen seien", consequently Jewish Christians, but it can be used metaphorically too. He concludes that nothing definite can be gathered from the address, but that, in view of other passages which refer to paganism as the past, the readers were *pagan Christians*. Such arguments can be found everywhere. Some, like Baljon, speak of a "metaphor"; others, like Zahn, mentally insert "gleich".

Although, as I have said, this interpretation is generally accepted, it is in contrast with the sense of the words. There is not one word which suggests a metaphorical meaning: the author was perfectly acquainted with the word *ὥς* (he uses it 24 times and twice in variants) but did not think it was worth adding at this point. Moreover, we do not read "exiles who are dispersed" (as we do in the most recent Dutch translation, that of the Ned. Bijbelgen.), but "exiles of the¹⁴¹ dispersion". The word *παρεπίδημος* has also been misinterpreted and people have forgotten to ask themselves

¹³⁹ Feine-Behm, *Einleitung*, p. 237.

¹⁴⁰ Appel, *Einleitung*, p. 105.

¹⁴¹ Omitting the article, since *διασπορά* was an established term.

from which circles the primitive Christian missions won supporters. Scholars have arrived at their incorrect exegesis first because they know no other way of tackling the problem, and second because *παροιμία* is mentioned in i 17 (see p. 31). In this context it can only mean "sojourn on earth as a place of exile". But does it follow that *παρεπίδημος* means this too?

It seems inadvisable to answer this last question in the affirmative if we look at ii 11: *ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπίδημους*. Here both words stand next to each other, so it is probable that they both mean something special. Now, *ὡς* is not supposed to denote a metaphorical usage: it refers to their behaviour, to what they are obliged to do because of their exile, not to the manner of their exile. *Παρεπίδημος* is a comparatively rare word,¹⁴² also used in the LXX, and it is odd that the same words employed in 1 Pet. ii 11 should also appear together here: Gen. xxiii 4, of Abraham in Palestine *πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐγὼ εἰμι* and Ps. xxxix (xxxviii) 13 *πάροικος ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ παρεπίδημος καθὼς πάντες οἱ πατέρες μου*. In both places the Hebrew text has *גר* and *תושב* respectively; the *ἐν τῇ γῇ* of the LXX has been added. According to Zahn¹⁴³ these words say nothing about an exile living among the people of Israel since the passages are about the patriarch Abraham and a pious Israelite who sees his life as that of his forefathers. But this view cannot be sustained when we see that Abraham is regarded as the first proselyte and is believed to be the *father of the proselytes*. He is considered the first proselyte because of Gen. xxiii 4, for *גר* means proselyte in later Hebrew.¹⁴⁴ *תושב* is a "Beisass, der sich irgendwo aufhält, ohne das Bürgerrecht zu haben".¹⁴⁵ There are extensive expositions of these terms from the time of later Judaism to which the reader is referred for further information, although it should be kept in mind that the terminology is not always stable and has exceptions.¹⁴⁶ The first word is often understood as "Voll-proselyt" or "proselyte of righteousness", *גר צדק*, the second as "Halb-proselyt" or "Beisass-proselyt", *גר תושב*. Moore raised objections to this distinction, and, in my opinion rightly, pointed out that Judaism only knew one category of proselytes, who were fully

¹⁴² W. Grundmann in: Kittel, II, p. 63-64.

¹⁴³ Zahn, *Einleitung*, II, p. 4.

¹⁴⁴ Billerbeck, III, p. 195.

¹⁴⁵ Gesenius-Buhl, *op. cit.*, p. 874 s.v.

¹⁴⁶ Bertholet, *op. cit.*; Schürer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 175, n. 71-p. 177; Billerbeck, II, p. 715-723; Moore, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 325-331, 338-341.

received into the covenant after three required ceremonies and were committed to the fulfilment of the Law.

Read with the significance which later Judaism attributed to these words Ps. xxxix necessarily refers to a dweller in the land without rights of citizenship. But the addition of the LXX ἐν τῇ γῇ must not be understood as "in the land", but as "on earth" (γῇ in the sense of "earth" is very frequent in the LXX; Hebrew ארץ).

How did I Peter understand this verse? Πάροικος, i.e. on the earth, (see also i 17) means: the fatherland is not here. And παρεπίδημος διασποράς i 1? Now, διασπορά is the usual term for the Jews who are dispersed.¹⁴⁷ They are "sojourners in the Diaspora". In ii 11 there is a combination of two ideas, a typical Oriental "Spielerei": these former pagans are exiles in a double sense, on the earth as πάροικοι and as παρεπίδημοι in the synagogue, the centre of Judaism in the "dispersion".

For i 1 is perfectly clear. The Diaspora is even indicated, namely in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia. In the third volume of his *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* Schürer described the life of the Jews in the Diaspora in pages which are still invaluable.¹⁴⁸ There we also find an extensive list of places where the Diaspora can be traced on the basis of literary evidence and inscriptions. It emerges that this was the case of all the places mentioned in I Pet. i 1.¹⁴⁹ The term in itself, then, is neither odd nor improbable.

Which circle of people does this concern? Bonsirven¹⁵⁰ rightly equates תושב = "craignant Dieu"; they are the φοβούμενοι or σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν. So, too, Billerbeck. This group is well known to us from the history of Paul's missionary journeys in Acts. They were people who were attracted by Jewish monotheism and kept certain commandments of the Mosaic Law without, however, becoming full Jews by being circumcised.¹⁵¹ "Although in a strict

¹⁴⁷ K. L. Schmidt in: Kittel, II, p. 98-104.

¹⁴⁸ Schürer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 1-187.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Schürer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 12-25; H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, t. VIII, I, Paris 1927, col. 76-81; Billerbeck, II, p. 609-611. This concerns the Diaspora; that is why Schürer's remark, *op. cit.*, III, p. 177-180, is irrelevant in this case, for it only applies to Palestine.

¹⁵⁰ Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 26. The question of the exact marking out of provincial borders is not relevant here.

¹⁵¹ Besides the literature in note 146 see Schürer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 174, n. 70, and p. 177, n. 72; Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 27-28; J. Juster, *Les juifs dans l'empire romain*, Paris, 1914, I, p. 274-277.

sense outside the pale of Judaism, (they) undoubtedly expected to share with Jews by birth the favor of the God they had adopted.”¹⁵² But they were not regarded as full Jews; they lacked the mark of the covenant, circumcision, and they could only take part in certain ceremonies. “En réalité ce prosélyte inférieur, non-circoncis, est considéré comme goy, un païen, à qui l’on concède quelques privilèges rares”.¹⁵³ For this view Moore refers to Paul’s words in Eph. ii 11-13, where the Apostle speaks of those who were once pagans, called “uncircumcised” by the “Circumcision”, alien to the citizenship of Israel and to the promises made to Israel. But they are brought into the nation in Christ. The language used shows that Paul is here employing terms applicable both to pagan and proselyte.¹⁵⁴

To such a circle the words of i 1 lead. Scholars have frequently had a false impression of primitive Christian propaganda, as is evident from the words of Feine quoted above. Jewish Christians and pagan Christians are spoken of in contrast to each other. This is a result of the views of the Tübingen school, but it is also the consequence of not taking enough account of reality. The Jewish missions had already been at work among the pagans¹⁵⁵ and people had assembled round the synagogues who were no longer pagans, but had not been fully converted to Judaism either.

From the way in which Paul set to work we see clearly that he was addressing Jews and the “godfearers” among them (cf. Acts xiii 16, 26, 43; xvi 14; xvii 7, 17; xviii 7). These godfearers saw that the God of Israel was the only God (cf. also Philo, *supra* p. 58 f.) and that it was only along this path of Judaism that they could be saved. In Acts xvii 2-3 we get a clear picture of how Paul preached among them: διελέξατο αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν, διανοίγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος ὅτι τὸν Χριστὸν ἔδει παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, ὁ Ἰησοῦς. By pagan Christians in this case we should understand those who had once been pagans but whose views on the way of salvation were Jewish.

We should notice παρατιθέμενος κτλ in this last quotation. The

¹⁵² Moore, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 325.

¹⁵³ Bonsirven, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 28. Even the man who had become a full proselyte was regarded as an inferior, despite the fact that he had fully joined the Covenant (see p. 43 f.). Cf. Schürer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 187.

¹⁵⁴ Billerbeck, III, p. 585-587, cf. Josephus, *c. Apion.* II 39 ἐκ μακροῦ.

¹⁵⁵ See A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*⁴, Leipzig 1924, I, p. 1-23, esp. p. 14-18.

principle developed from the scriptures (viz. that the Christ had to suffer and to rise from the dead) is applied to Jesus the Christ. This is a remarkable idea which can also be found in 1 Pet., as we already observed in the exegesis of i 18-19 (p. 50). But we can see at every moment that words and modes of expression are here being used which, as such, could be purely Jewish, but become applicable to the Christians through Christ (see also p. 63 f. on i 2). In i 20 we read that Christ is revealed $\delta\iota' \ \upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$.¹⁵⁶

For a concrete case of one such "godfearer" who comes to the belief in Christ we have only to read the passage concerning Cornelius in Acts x.

In the view of the addressees of the epistle which I have put forward justice is done to the elements of truth in the prevailing opinion and in that of Weiss-Kühl by letting the texts speak for themselves. Oddly enough, almost a hundred and fifty years ago Michaelis had an inkling of this in his *Einleitung*. He based himself on ii 11 and spoke of "proselytes of the gate", a term wrong in itself, as later research has shown, but the group of people he meant was the right one. Zahn and Moffatt only mention Michaelis' view as a sort of intuition.¹⁵⁷ No serious discussion was devoted to it. I reproduced Zahn's confutation earlier and showed it to be incorrect (p. 72). Moffatt dismissed the matter by saying that the opinions of Michaelis and others did not rest on facts. I hope to have marshalled enough evidence in this study to persuade critics that Michaelis' intuition did indeed set him on the right track and that scholars were wrong not to take his view seriously.¹⁵⁸

Why did 1 Peter address himself to those Christians from the circles of godfearers? He himself states his objective in v 12 with

¹⁵⁶ The Dutch text (p. 95 last par.) is not very clear. The English text represents an attempt to reconstruct the line of thought which seems to underly the Dutch (ed.).

¹⁵⁷ Zahn, *Einleitung*, II, p. 4 and Moffatt, *Introduction*, p. 339.

¹⁵⁸ I should perhaps point out that I did not reach my present view simply through testing this theory. I came to it as I was preparing a sermon on 1 Pet. i 18-19 on Good Friday, 1940. It was then that I became aware of a number of weaknesses in the current exegesis and of the parallel with Lev. xxii, although I did not immediately see the consequences of this parallel. It was only after I had done the exegesis (chap. V), which pointed to an early dating, that I looked for further evidence and found an astonishing abundance of it. This made it imperative to provide an explanation which radically altered the image I had previously had of the epistle from the literature concerning it.

the maximum clarity: δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα, παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἣν στῆτε.

Bornemann made the revealing comment "eine nichtssagende Bemerkung"¹⁵⁹ about this verse. He therefore considered himself fully entitled to follow Harnack in dismissing it as a later addition. So radical a step should not be taken, however. The verse is highly significant and fits perfectly in the epistle. But we must read it correctly, and this seems to be impossible. All expositors have been puzzled by the last words εἰς ἣν στῆτε. This is an old difficulty for, judging from the variants, attempts had already been made in Antiquity to change them to ἐστήκατε; connected with this εἰς would then be equivalent to ἐν in accordance with usage in Koiné. Appealing to Knopf, Appel¹⁶⁰ explained ἐστήκατε as the "allein möglichen Lesart". Blass-Debrunner also say that Nestle's reading is simply impossible: the perfect must be maintained: "das στῆτε 'tretet hinein' der andern Hdschr. würde zu εἰς passen, ist aber dem Sinn nach unmöglich".¹⁶¹ Scholars then resorted to a translation like "stand fast in it" (R.S.V.)—an independent clause with the verb in the imperative. They may be right, but there is a better way.

This "lectio difficilior", however, seems to fit so perfectly. Στῆτε is a very regular form, 2nd person plural subjunctive aorist III; the subjunctive is here rightly used in a relative clause, dependent on an accusative and infinitive.¹⁶² We only have to think of the "conversion" which is constantly being mentioned in this epistle. As we saw (p. 59) various verbs are used for it. They, who at first were "no people", have now become "God's own people" (ii 9-10). According to Philo Judaism prided itself on the fact that entry into the community brought men to "truth". But, Peter knows of another truth "exhorting and declaring that that is the true grace of God *wherein you now stand*" by coming as "proselytes" to Christianity (on χάρις see also i 10 προφηται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες of the glory which has come over the pagans who have become a "people"). He thus gives "exhortations"—the epistle is full of them—and testifies to this being the true relationship with God. This introduces a unity into the epistle

¹⁵⁹ W. Bornemann, *Der erste Petrusbrief—eine Taufrede des Silvanus?* in: *Zeitschrift f. die neuest. Wissenschaft*, 1919/1920, p. 144.

¹⁶⁰ Appel, *op. cit.*, p. 104, n.1.

¹⁶¹ Blass-Debrunner, *Grammatik*, p. 121, § 205.

¹⁶² Kühner-Gerth, *Satzlehre*, II, p. 555.

which has often been accused of not having a clear structure. That words considered inexplicable should hereby obtain a correct meaning indicates the view of the epistle which I have conveyed.

What we read of the *χάρις*, viz. that it is *ἀληθής*, is thus in antithesis to a "false" one. The author's objective in this work is to show that the "godfearers" (we find this term on various occasions in 1 Pet.; cf. p. 30 ff), who always stood just outside Judaism and could never share fully in the covenant because they had not been circumcised, have now been accepted, and, through Christ's work, can now participate fully in what Judaism had taught them to regard as an unreachable ideal. They themselves have become a priesthood which can offer to God (ii 5), something which was out of the question even for a full proselyte.¹⁶³

This is immediately evident from the address to the "exiles of the diaspora" who are marked as "chosen" with every kind of designation as the people of God. We can trace various themes designating Christian life in our epistle back to the terminology of proselytism. Through Christ the readers share fully in the privileges of the People of the Covenant, but at the same time they are obliged to obey the commandments of Christ. Therefore the author also speaks of the hope which they have (i 3, 13, 21; iii 5, 15) for, before that time, when they were still seeking salvation in the Synagogue, the situation was really hopeless. But in this epistle we are told that everything required in order to join the nation of the Lord has taken place (Baptism and Offering).¹⁶⁴

What is striking is that, *however hard we try, we find no reference to Circumcision*. This was the third in the series of ceremonies, but the author does not mention it. The question is, then, could it be left out? There are certain indications suggesting that one could dispense with this mark of the Covenant. Ananias, for example, through whose mediation Izates was converted to Judaism, advised his royal proselyte not to have himself circumcised. Josephus, *Antiqu.* XX 2, 4 δύνασθαι δ' αὐτὸν ἔφη καὶ χωρὶς τῆς περιτομῆς τὸ θεῖον σέβειν, εἴγε πάντως κέκρικε ζηλοῦν τὰ πάτρια τῶν Ἰουδαίων· τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναι κυριώτερον τοῦ περιτέμνεσθαι. Later a Galilean, Eleazar, described as someone *πάνυ περὶ τὰ πάτρια δοκῶν ἀκριβῆς εἶναι*, persuades him to accept it. This would suggest that there was

¹⁶³ Billerbeck, II, p. 704.

¹⁶⁴ This would also explain the similarity with Titus, since he too was uncircumcised (see note 121).

both a stricter and a laxer practice—a view confirmed by a discussion in the Talmud *Yebamoth* 46 a¹⁶⁵ from which it appears that there was no agreement about whether someone who was circumcised without having been baptised could be regarded as a proselyte, and vice versa. Amongst other things we read: “Vielmehr ist betreffs desjenigen, der das Tauchbad genommen hat, aber nicht beschnitten ist, alle Welt einig, das er etwas davon hat (d.h. als Proselyt gelte).” This is c. 90 A.D. According to Moore the majority did not allow themselves to be misled by such jeux d’esprit and regarded *both* baptism and circumcision as necessary.¹⁶⁶ Schürer,¹⁶⁷ too, broached the question. Besides the example of Izates he referred to the *Oracula Sibyllina* IV 164 where baptism alone is mentioned, and to a passage in Arrian όταν δ’ ἀναλάβῃ τὸ πάθος τὸ τοῦ βεβαμμένου καὶ ῥηγμένου, τότε καὶ ἔστι τῷ ὄντι καὶ καλεῖται Ἰουδαῖος. According to him this was only accepted because circumcision was too painful for many to bear.

In the margin of his edition Nestle referred at iii 20 to the well-known passage Col. ii 11-13: ἐν ᾧ (Χριστῷ) καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνεγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα.

However we explain the words and however we imagine the sequence of events, it is clear that according to Paul both baptism and circumcision coincide for those dead in the *παραπτώματα* and *ἀκροβυστία*. Baptism, in which the Christian is buried with Christ, is at the same time the *περιτομή*. It is perfectly possible that this was also the idea of 1 Pet. iii.

In any case it is certain that there was some argument amongst the Christians, as well as amongst the Rabbis, about the question of circumcision. See Acts xv: brethren came from Judea who taught ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ περιτμηθῇτε τῷ ἔθει τῷ Μωυσέως, οὐ δύνασθε σωθῆναι (N.B. the last word, also the most important thing for 1 Peter. Cf. σῶζω iii 21; iv 18—σωτηρία i 5, 9, 10; ii 2).

Where the wind is blowing from is explained in vs. 5: it comes

¹⁶⁵ Billerbeck, I, p. 106-107.

¹⁶⁶ Moore, *loc. cit.*, III, p. 110, n. 103.

¹⁶⁷ Schürer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 173 and p. 183-185.

from the Pharisees who have joined the faithful (the Pharisees were ἀκριβεῖς as to the Law, Phil. iii 5 and cf. p. 77 f.). The nub of the question is thus *whether the same things were required of the pagans who come to the community of Christ as of the (full) Jewish proselyte*. There is no mention of baptism because that *was* practised (see Acts viii 38 and above all the important passage on Peter's visit to Cornelius, Acts x 47). But in Acts xv Peter does not mention circumcision either. He has seen that God has poured forth His Spirit on the pagans, and that is sufficient. The baptism of purification is necessary ¹⁶⁸ as a sign that sins have been put away. Baljon is therefore right in saying that the Peter of this epistle is the Peter of Acts xv.¹⁶⁹

A word must also be said about the persecutions to which the Christians were subjected, particularly since most scholars have looked here for the cause of the epistle.¹⁷⁰ iv 12 ff. speaks about this. The readers are put to shame and slandered: ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ ὡς Χριστιανοί. They are attacked because of the name of Christ and the confession of Christ. Now, nowhere do we read that they suffered from the pagan authorities: ¹⁷¹ on the contrary, the author exhorts them to honour the emperor (ii 13-17). We then think of the pagan surroundings and the persecution which might have arisen there, but we read nothing about that either. Is it not more obvious to think of persecution by the Synagogue? What the addressees suffer is shame and slander: there is no question of execution. But slander is constantly repeated. The opponents are people οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφὴν (iii 16). In ii 12 we have an example of change of subject, something which is by no means uncommon in Eastern writers: the subject of καταλαλοῦσιν is the Jews, of δοξάσωσιν, however, the pagans. That is why Christ, who Himself underwent betrayal and death at the

¹⁶⁸ J. de Zwaan, *De Handelingen der Apostelen*² in: *Tekst en Uitleg*, Groningen-Batavia 1931, p. 45-48.

¹⁶⁹ J. M. S. Baljon, *Geschiedenis van de Boeken des Nieuwen Verbonds*, Groningen 1900, p. 215, although he does not believe that 1 Pet. was by St Peter, the Apostle.

¹⁷⁰ How forced this procedure was and how extensively scholars have built on an extremely weak foundation is evident in the treatment of the relationship between Jas. and 1 Pet. in A. Meyer, *Das Rätsel des Jacobus-briefes, Beiheft zur Z.N.W.*; Giessen 1930, p. 72-82 (It also emerges that this result where 1 Pet. is concerned had serious consequences for the introductory questions of the other books).

¹⁷¹ Confutation in Zahn, *Einleitung*, II, p. 40-41.

hands of the Jews, can be an example to them (chap. ii and iii). This too fits perfectly into the picture that we get in Acts of the earliest mission. There, again and again, it is the Jews who resist and slander Paul and his companions (see Acts xiii 50; xiv 19; xvii 5, 13).

"Those who do not believe" in ii 7 are the Jews. 1 Peter uses the quotation from Is. xxviii 16, just as Paul does in Rom. ix 32-33. The fact that Hosea is also cited in the same context, however, does not mean that 1 Peter is dependent on Paul: these words from Hosea are in the right place in 1 Pet. ii 10. We must assume that that applied to the disobedience of the Jews; it was a general conviction of the primitive Christian community (Is. xxviii 10). The common divergence from the LXX is therefore far from being conclusive, to say the least, since the Greek translation is full of variants. The Jews, too, are referred to in the quotation of Prov. xi 31 LXX εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σφύζεται, ὁ δὲ ἄσεβής καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται iv 18—note the savage sneer in these words, for the people of Israel prided themselves on "being just" as compared to the pagans and condemned the pagans as ἄσεβής and ἁμαρτωλός; they are now getting their own accusations flung back in their teeth.

After what has been said little more evidence is needed to prove that there is no objection to seeing the Apostle Peter as the author, (as i 1 says) who has availed himself of the help of Silvanus for his task (v 12). The situation which emerges from the epistle makes it difficult to argue *against* Peter's authorship (Gal. ii 7 will not do as contrary evidence since it was as the "Apostle of the Circumcision" that Peter's word carried weight with the "godfearers"). If anything, it argues *in favour* of it.

Moffatt has discussed extensively the similarity between the expressions which Peter uses in Acts and in this epistle. He concludes: "There is enough to indicate that the tradition underlying the speeches reflects the same mind as the epistle."¹⁷² In v 1 the author refers to himself as a "witness of the sufferings of Christ". Why this should be interpreted "mystically", as Dibelius claims,¹⁷³ is a mystery. According to Bornemann¹⁷⁴ there is nothing in the entire epistle which points to Peter. He dismisses the first and last

¹⁷² Moffatt, *Introduction*, p. 335.

¹⁷³ M. Dibelius, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin-Leipzig 1926, p. 44.

¹⁷⁴ Bornemann, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

verses on the grounds of incorrect exegesis, however—an easy way of twisting things in any manner one likes. Nor can we be particularly impressed by the so-called argument against the authenticity based on considerations about how someone like Peter could actually have spoken. All we can say to that is that he did not speak as defenders of this argument think he spoke, and that if their image of Peter does not fit in with what they find in the epistle they must revise it.¹⁷⁵

Many points of community have been detected in the epistles of Paul and 1 Peter—so many that there has even been talk of an “Abklatsch paulinischer Arbeiten” (Jülicher-Fascher). That the latter is therefore dependent on the former is by no means self-evident, however. It is perfectly possible that *there was a far more consonant tradition than the contrast made by the Tübingen school between “the Petrine and the Pauline” has led many scholars to believe*. Yet, as I showed on p. 53, there are a number of *supposed* similarities, and a correct exegesis brings out the individual character of the epistle. In any case, in a discussion of Paul’s relationship with the first apostles this epistle should not be dismissed as a post-apostolic work, but should be brought into the discussion too.

The place where 1 Pet. was written may well have been Rome. Apart from the information in commentaries and introductions there is nothing more to say about this for the time being.

CONCLUSION II. The first epistle of St. Peter is a work from the period before 70 A.D., addressed by the apostle Peter to people who had formerly been pagans, had joined the Synagogue as “godfearers”, but had later been converted to Christianity. The author assures his readers that they have been fully received into the “Covenant” through Christ as full proselytes, and he exhorts them to live as true Christians, “children of obedience”.

In this way all the data and the texts can be explained without being forced. Otherwise we run aground. I have treated all the principal points discussed in current N.T. Introduction. Within the framework of this study it was not necessary either to confute other views extensively or to go into partition theories which are superfluous.

Having said this I should add the following:

¹⁷⁵ How difficult it was to find the good treatment of introductory questions can be seen in B. H. Streeter’s excellent book, *The Primitive Church*, London 1929, p. 115-133.

1. A renewed investigation of the significance of the "blood of Christ" in connection with the proselyte's offering is desirable. The full meaning of Proselytism for Christian preaching, as it has come down to us in the N.T., should be examined with fresh eyes.

2. For a long time scholars attached an individual "Lehrbegriff" to each epistle in describing N.T. theology. Today, however, we have got over that form of analysis and talk more of the one Kerygma of the N.T. in synthesis. Although we should continue to do this, we must not neglect the approach preferred by our predecessors. This seems clear enough.

3. The significance of Confessions of faith for the exegesis of the N.T. has been amply discussed in recent years, particularly in Holland. The exegesis of 1 Pet. i 18-19 should be a warning not to forget that the various Confessions base themselves on a particular interpretation which *can be incorrect* and which should not be binding.

ABBREVIATIONS

Billerbeck = H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1922-1928, Bd. I-IV.

Bauer = W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des N.T. und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*³, Berlin 1937.

Kittel = G. Kittel et al., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, Stuttgart 1933-Bd. I-IV (up to the date of the present article fascicle 16 of this last volume has appeared, as far as p. 1024).

The Septuagint is quoted after the edition by H. B. Swete, Cambridge 3-4 1905-1909, 3 vols.

The New Testament is quoted after the edition by E. Nestle¹⁴, Stuttgart 1930.

THE TEACHING OF GOOD WORKS IN 1 PETER *

Is it unfair to say that the ethical teaching of the N.T. is a step-child of scholarship? Over against ten books on N.T. theology one can hardly find one work on N.T. ethics. This holds good both for general surveys and for monographs. It goes without saying that the moral implications and consequences of the new faith are not absolutely neglected, but on the whole the doctrinal aspect has been stressed far more than the ethical. It is not my task at the present moment to explain this fact, but it did not seem out of place to call special attention to this "under-developed country". Work in this part of the field is not at all superfluous. Therefore the discussion of a particular point in a paper for this general meeting will be fully justified.¹

That the choice fell on the First Epistle of Peter may be explained by the following reasons:

1. This Epistle largely embodies traditional material of Christian teaching. On the one hand, there are relations to many other books of the N.T., sometimes in remarkable parallels, sometimes in very slight traces; on the other hand, some of its thoughts are reflected in the earliest post-canonical writing, 1 Clement, and it is beyond question that it is quoted by Polycarp. It may be asked, what is the exact nature of this relationship and what is the place of this letter in the whole development of early Christianity. It has often been thought that the writer was a disciple of Paul who repeated some of the thoughts of the great Apostle while toning down the highest theological conceptions of his master. This post-Pauline origin cannot, in my opinion, be maintained any longer. Various authors such as G. Kittel, Behm, Michaelis, de Zwaan, V. Taylor and Selwyn have in recent years defended the authorship of Peter.

* Appeared in *New Test. Studies* I, 1954, p. 92-110.

¹ Paper read at the General Meeting of the S.N.T.S. in Cambridge, 9 September 1953. It is printed here in its original form. In the meantime two other publications touching upon the same subject came to my notice: W. Brandt, *Wandel als Zeugnis nach dem 1 Petrusbrief*, in *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum, eine Festschrift für Prof. D. Otto Schmitz* (Witten-Ruhr, 1953), pp. 10-25, and E. Lohse, *Paränese und Kerygma im 1. Petrusbrief*, in *Zeitschrift f.d. neuest. Wissenschaft*, XLV (1954), pp. 68-90. After some consideration it seemed advisable to leave my text unaltered.

Neither dependence on Paul nor the identification of the troubles mentioned in ch. iv with the persecution under Domitian or even Trajan (to which I shall return presently) are sufficiently weighty to settle the matter. On the contrary, the comparison in i 18-19 can only have its full force if the letter was written before the fall of the Temple in A.D. 70, as I pointed out in a Dutch publication of 1942.² There are no cogent arguments which prevent us from seeing in Peter the mind which directed the hand of Silvanus (v. 12). The latter name gives a link with Paul. In this case the letter ranks beside the Pauline Epistles, and their agreement is not one of dependence but of parallelism. This insight has far-reaching consequences for the investigation and description of N.T. theology and ethics. There is much common ground between the "apostle of the circumcision" and the "apostle of the Gentiles" and a comparison of their writings brings to light what was the faith of the Church, say between A.D. 50-60. It is one of the most outstanding of the many services rendered by Dr Selwyn in his excellent commentary that he gave such a full discussion of the problem. If this is true, it will be of the utmost importance to explore the contents of this writing with great care, to see what it is saying before anything else. For even where we see a writer using traditional schemes, he always gives them a special turn;³ and this rule holds good in this case as well, as is shown by a careful comparison of his "Haustafel" with those in other early Christian writings.

2. This Epistle is specially concerned with the attitude of the Christians in the world of their days. In various places—one may say, in dealing with every topic—he mentions the fact that Christians are called to do "good works". It is not over-emphasizing a particular idea, but following the clue which leads to the heart of the writer's intention, if one tries to understand what he meant by *καλὰ ἔργα* and *ἀγαθοποιῆα*. In this general term to which he resorts time and again he expressed something of Christianity which was very dear to him. "*Ἀγαθοποιεῖν* is, indeed", said Dr Selwyn, "one of the keywords of the Epistle, occurring more frequently in one

² W. C. van Unnik, *De verlossing i Petrus i 18-19 en het probleem van den eersten Petrusbrief*, in *Mededelingen der Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen*, afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, vol. 5, no. 1 (Amsterdam, 1942), English translation in this volume p. 3-82.

³ As may, for example, be seen from the ways in which the later apologists handle such traditional schemes; the borrowing is not the only important fact, but also the application.

form or another, than in the whole of the rest of the New Testament put together".⁴

What did the writer mean by this idea of "good works"? It is important to put this question, because the answer may throw fresh light upon the ethical attitude of the Church in the middle of the first century, stepping out of the boundaries of Palestine into the wider regions of Asia Minor and the Roman Empire in general. It may, however, seem somewhat absurd to ask it, since it is apparently so clear to everybody that little or no attention has been paid to it. In many expositions of the Epistle this keyword is passed over without further comment. It is striking, even somewhat baffling, to see that Hastings' *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church* did not devote an article to this subject, probably on the assumption that the readers would be good enough to know it themselves. The short discussion of the word by Grundmann⁵ does not give a full analysis and is quite unsatisfactory. Nevertheless there are sound reasons which prevent us from leaving the matter in this stage of taking it for granted. If one only remembers the fact that ever since the Reformation the character of the "bona opera" and their place in the process of salvation has been hotly debated between Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians, that the meritorious value of "good works" was maintained or denied and their place in Christian life was differently estimated, with all its consequences for behaviour and society, it becomes quite clear that very wide divergences as to the nature of our subject are possible and that they have far-reaching theological and ethical implications. I am not inclined to lay the N.T. evidence upon the Procrustean bed of later constructions, but the least one can say is that there is something going on which might be highly important indeed.

What Dr Selwyn, who was fully aware of the importance of this notion, had to say on it, does not seem to have any connexion with the older controversies. He pointed out that ἀγαθοποιῆα conveyed the idea "of active kindness and discharge of social duty" and that "it is assumed that hearers and readers know what goodness is, or at least can recognize it when they see it. There is no suggestion that it has no meaning or value apart from revelation, though revelation extends its scope";⁶ later on in commenting upon ii 20 he says:

⁴ E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St Peter* (London, 1946), p. 89.

⁵ W. Grundmann, in G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart, 1938), vol. III, pp. 547 ff., cf. also vol. I, p. 17.

⁶ Selwyn, *loc. cit.* p. 89.

"it is important to emphasize that the Christian way of life demands a spirit of beneficence even in the discharge of 'the trivial round, the common task'".⁷ The Swedish scholar Bo Reicke in his book *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism* moved along the same line though with a slightly different accent, defining it as "blameless behaviour from the point of view of society" and stressing its social and political connotation.⁸ Is it claiming too much, if one says that this answer leaves something to be desired? I do not think so, for the right setting of this idea remains obscure. The letter was not written in a vacuum, but by a Christian author in the ancient world addressed to a particular group of readers. What then was the source of this particular notion? Was it an original invention of the author or did he borrow it from elsewhere? What was its relation to the Christian faith, as it is expressed in this Epistle and for what reason did he use it? Dr Reicke has an interesting footnote⁹ in which he observes that Peter's conception is totally different from what the Jews called *ma'asim tovim* = "good works", and that "one must therefore be careful in saying that there has been a relapse into the righteousness of good works of Judaism, e.g. in the Pastoral and General Epistles". This observation reveals that there is something peculiar about the "good works" in 1 Peter, but since Reicke's book was concerned with another problem, it just remained an *obiter dictum* which does not prevent, but calls for further investigation. Does this word indicate in some way or other a characteristic element in the ethics of the N.T.?

A fruitful starting-point for our inquiry is given in the work of a classical scholar, the late professor of Ancient History in my own university, Dr Hendrik Bolkestein. In his excellent book, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum*,¹⁰ which fully merits the attention of the N.T. scholar, he pointed out that there is a deep contrast between the ancient oriental and the classical conception of doing good; among oriental peoples (of which he specially treated Egypt and Israel) the object of this moral activity is always the poor and oppressed, while for the Greeks and Romans beneficence is not restricted to the poor but has a much wider

⁷ Selwyn, *loc. cit.* p. 178.

⁸ B. Reicke, *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism* (Koebenhavn, 1946), pp. 211-13.

⁹ B. Reicke, *loc. cit.* p. 212, n. 2.

¹⁰ H. Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum* (Utrecht, 1939).

extent, being given to the whole of society. This thesis, illustrated by a wealth of material won through sound terminological research, is explained from the differences in social structure, and in political and religious attitude. For our purpose it is not necessary to give a survey of Bolkestein's interesting semasiological studies of words like ἔλεος, δικαιοσύνη, φιάνθρωπος, "poor", etc., nor of his brilliant exposition of economic history and morals with regard to this problem in antiquity, nor to discuss the thesis itself. But for two questions it is worthwhile bringing in his book: (1) on what side of the line does Christianity stand? (2) what was the difference between the Greek and Jewish conception, for these two are of immediate importance for the background of early Christianity?

As to the first point his conclusion is: "Die Wohltätigkeit ist nach *Inhalt* und *Praxis* in der altchristlichen Welt die gleiche wie in der altorientalischen: sie besteht in Barmherzigkeit gegen Arme und Hilfeleistung an sie. Die Werke der Wohltätigkeit, wie sie in Matthäus xxv genannt werden und die Grundlage der späteren christlichen Wohltätigkeit bilden, kennt auch die ägyptische Moral in der gleichen Formulierung. Es besteht aber ein wesentlicher Unterschied in der *Begründung*" (p. 439, cf. 15, 416-17), the motive being here the love towards God which includes the love of one's neighbour. Is this judgement right as far as the N.T. is concerned? It is interesting to see that Bolkestein here and elsewhere specially mentions Matt. xxv, this penetrating description of the Last Judgement which must have made a deep impression on later generations, but that he did not give a full treatment of the whole of the N.T. As far as the later centuries of the Church are concerned this judgement may be right; one has only to read Cyprian's *De operibus et eleemosynis* to see it. "Good works" has got a special meaning and a special place. Illuminating is this passage from Chrysostom (*Hom. in Pent.* 1, 6, *M.S.G.* 1, 462 f.): "All that has been written down before baptism (viz. sins), is blotted out by the water of baptism and the cross of Christ ... but much zeal is needed for what happens after baptism in order that it may be blotted out. For there is no second laver, but what is needed is our tears, repentance, confession, almsgiving, prayer and all other good works". In this Christian conception of "good works" they are deeds of humiliation, of the right Christian attitude measured by the standards of the Church, not only concerned with the poor, and are means to do away with post-baptismal sins in order to have

the right relation with God (cf. also Cyril of Jerusalem, *Hom. Cat.* xv, 23, where a similar list is given in contrast to all sorts of vices like greed, theft, murder, fornication). This interesting development, which fell outside the scope of Bolkestein's book, cannot be sketched here, but it is sufficient for the moment to have this interpretation of such an influential preacher.

As to the second point, let us first see what was the content of the idea among the Greeks and Romans. Though it is mentioned many times it is never connected with almsgiving; its objects are parents, friends, the state or nation; it is synonymous with "to be useful", "to do something agreeable to a person", "to assist". "Im allgemeinen heißt 'wohlthun', wenn Menschen, die durch Geist oder in anderer Hinsicht hervorrangen ... ihren Mitmenschen etwas schenken", either material help, good counsel or simple friendliness, even the poor can benefit the rich man. The motive may be the utilitarian principle "do ut des" or the thirst for glory, but also according to an oft-quoted saying the imitation of the Deity: Θεοῦ ὁμοίον ἔχει ἄνθρωπος τὸ εὐποιεῖν, for the Deity does something good to mankind directly like Prometheus or Hercules or by His providence. This view may be well illustrated by some words of the contemporary of the N.T. Seneca, who says in *De Beneficiis* 1, 6, 1 "Quid est ergo beneficium? Benevola actio tribuens gaudium capiensque tribuendo in id, quod facit prona et sponte sua parata. Itaque non quid fiat aut quid detur refert, sed qua mente", and in 1, 2, 4 "alium re, alium fide, alium gratia, alium consilio, alium praeceptis salubribus adiuva". To summarize: it is a virtue of friendliness and willingness to help towards all men without distinction.¹¹

Let us now turn to the Jewish side. In the rabbinical writings the expression "good works" is often found. In some places it is combined with Torah; study of the Law must be combined with practice, but the ordinary word here is *mišwa*.¹² But most usual is its equation with "works of charity" (*gemiluth chasadim*) such as visitation of the sick, hospitality towards strangers, aid to poor brides, assistance in marriage and funeral ceremonies, care for the dead, comforting the distressed, etc. They are distinct from alms-

¹¹ A wealth of illustrative material from the sources will be found in Bolkestein, *loc. cit.* pp. 95 ff. and 297 ff.

¹² H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München, 1922-8), Vol. III, pp. 505 and 161.

giving (= righteousness!) because the latter can be done with money while the former demand personal participation, the latter can only benefit the poor and the living, while the former have to do with the rich and the dead as well (*Tosephta Pea* 4, 19, Bill. iv, 536); therefore "works of charity" have more credit than almsgiving. The fullest treatment of the subject may be found in Billerbeck's Commentary.¹³ These "good works" are distinct from the *mišwoth*, in so far as they are not expressly commanded in the Torah. Those who do them may be sure of great reward not only in this world, but also in the world to come; "for", says the *Apoc. of Baruch* xiv 12, "the righteous justly hope for the end, and without fear depart from this habitation, because they have with Thee a store of works preserved in treasures";¹⁴ they receive possessions on earth, are saved from punishment, are protected by God; thereby the great men like Abraham and Moses have excelled and are examples; "wrong inclination" is subjugated, sins are atoned.

According to some rabbinical sayings God Himself did so and must be imitated. Was this duty extended to all men? The sources are not very clear on this point. Bonsirven declares: "Si les obligations de justice sont moins rigoureuses envers les gentils, à plus forte raison toutes les obligations qui relèvent plus ou moins de la charité",¹⁵ though he admits that practice was better than theory. At any rate, in view of the fact that the Jewish nation held a special place and that Jews ran great risks of uncleanness through contact with pagans (idolatry!), it is feasible that there were great restrictions. Though the systematization and Scriptural foundation may be the work of later rabbis, it is beyond question that this conception of "good works" existed in the time of the N.T. (cf. Tobit; Matt. xxv 35 ff., Mark xiv 6, Acts ix 36).

In B.T., *Sota*, fol. 14a, a saying of R. Simlai ($\pm$ 250) is recorded: the Torah contains *gemiluth chasadim* at the beginning and at the end, for the Lord made clothes for Adam and Eve and He buried

¹³ Billerbeck, *loc. cit.* vol. IV, pp. 559 ff. An interesting testimony is also found in the Apology of Aristides, xiv, 3, ed. E. J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen, 1914), p. 18: et amore hominum quem habent (sc. Iudaei) deum imitantur, cum pauperum misereantur et captivos redimant et mortuos sepeliant et his similia faciant, quae deo accepta et hominibus grata sunt, quae a maioribus suis acceperunt.

¹⁴ Billerbeck, *loc. cit.* vol. I, pp. 429 ff. gives a good many examples for this idea of a "treasury in heaven".

¹⁵ J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus Christ* (Paris, 1935), vol. II, p. 265.

Moses. In the Greek sphere the εὐεργεσία of the Deity has a far wider meaning, it starts by giving men the possibilities of life in general. The Jewish idea contained the thought of a treasury in heaven while in one of the Greek authors it is said that one should do good to men in order to have a treasure with a grateful person. These differences clarify the variety of conception. For though Bolkestein was not completely fair in saying that among the Jews beneficence was specially concerned with the poor, it is true that "good works" are limited here to certain classes of men with particular reference to the poor and afflicted. In Greek thought and life it comprised a much wider area, was extended to all men. In Jewish thought it was of course connected with the Law and had the character of something supererogatory while this is most naturally missing among the Greeks. Another difference is the idea of retribution, for the Jewish belief in the hereafter was a strong stimulus which was unknown to the Greeks.

Thus we have discovered and briefly described three types of "good works", the "Christian", the "Greek", and the "Jewish". What will be our result, if we now continue to ask to which of the three Peter showed an inclination? Or had he a type of his own?

The leading motive of this letter is unequivocally expressed by the author in v 12, "By Silvanus, our faithful brother, as I account him, I have written unto you briefly exhorting and adjuring that this is the true grace of God in which you must take your stand". The exhortation and encouragement (παράκλησις) is found especially in the latter part of the letter from ii 11 onward, while the opening section (i 1-ii 10) may fitly be described as an ἐπιμαρτυρία, a true witness of what the Christian faith really means. The readers have been former pagans who have been won for Christianity; they are now members of the people of God's covenant through the death of Christ and may live in the hope of future blessedness through Christ's resurrection. They who with all probability once belonged to that class of adherents to the synagogue who were called "god-fearers" must not be wavering in their faith¹⁶ nor be troubled by the sufferings they have to undergo, but completely break with the old habits and live according to the will of God. He may test the faith by suffering in the joyful expectation of the revelation of Jesus

¹⁶ See p. 71 f.

Christ. The rule of the Lord's life: "Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory" (Luke xxiv 26), reflected in i 11, is also operative in the lives of His disciples (iv 1, 13). But this time of suffering, fierce though it be, will be a short one (i 6, v 10). A strong eschatological note runs through the whole letter. Christ was manifested at the end of the times (i 20) and now "the end of all things is at hand" (iv 7), the final judgement is about to begin (iv 5, 17). The "Naherwartung" has not faded away, but possesses its full stimulating force. There is a strong probability that this Epistle was originally sent to people who were newly baptized (iii 21, iv 1-2, ii 1) to encourage them for their future life as Christians by the reminder of the calling of the faithful God to a life of eternal glory after the troubles in the present world, by setting them upon the only firm foundation of the deliverance through Christ Jesus and by developing the Christian rule of life in the given circumstances: obedience to God's will in the midst of disobedience. Watchfulness and loving-kindness must be the marked features of their lives while the adversary, the devil is, walking about. The holy God demands holy men (i 15-16). Meekness towards men and fear of the Lord are the rule of conduct for those who perfectly hope even under tribulations. These thoughts the writer expresses in slightly varying ways for his readers who evidently are slandered and run risks because of their Christian profession. It is a clear exposition of the Christian attitude "between the times" ("Zwischen den Zeiten").

After this brief outline of the general trend of thought a closer scrutiny of the passages where "good works" are mentioned may follow. The various texts can be reviewed in the order of their place in the letter except for the first one (ii 12) which has some special difficulties and makes it advisable to deal with it at the end.¹⁷

a) ii 13-17. This first item out of three dealing with "subjection" (ii 13, 18; iii 1) is addressed to the readers in general, admonishing them to obey human authority, *inter alia* the governors sent by the emperor "for vengeance on evil-doers and for praise of them that do well". This general rule runs parallel to Paul's exposition in

¹⁷ In the next paragraphs I give the upshot of the exegesis of the various passages after having consulted the commentaries of Bigg, Windisch, Schlatter, Greydanus, Knopf, Vrede, Wohlenberg, Gunkel, Hauck, Selwyn as far as our subject is concerned. It would have taken us too far, if I had tried to give a discussion of details and divergent opinions of commentators.

Rom. xiii 1-5, though the latter has clearly given a paraphrase of his own. Ἀγαθοποιός is here the contrast of κακοποιός, a man who does anything against the social order. But since it is specially said that the ἀγαθοποιοί are praised, this word must have a more specific meaning, for people obeying the law are not distinguished in a particular way, their conformity being taken for granted. So Selwyn was right in pointing to special honours lists; it is well known that εὐεργέται of Greek communities were often honoured by tablets in the market-place extolling the great services they rendered to the State. Therefore something more than doing one's duty is implied here; it means, people who do something deserving a special distinction. This is the will of God—and here an idea that has no parallel in Paul comes in—for by rendering this special service they “will put to silence the ignorance of foolish men”, since now public honours will be bestowed on them. The interesting thing is that the human authorities are supposed to recognize what is “well-doing”, and that a general rule of the state towards its citizens is meant, which must be—according to the will of God—an incitement for the Christians to live up to this standard of first-class citizens in order to stop slander against Christianity. Therefore this obedience is διὰ τὸν Κύριον. Christian freedom does not mean freedom from all bonds nor a smoke-screen for wickedness as it has often been used in the course of history for licentious living and revolution. The Christian is free because he is a slave of God (cf. Paul); this slavery gives the law, even with regard to loyalty to human authority. All should be held in honour, not only the brotherhood by love (cf. i 22) and the Lord by fear (i 17), but also the emperor (note the divergence from Prov. xxiv 21, “my son, fear thou the Lord and the king!”).

b) ii 18-25. An exhortation to house-slaves (οἰκέται) who were specially exposed to the caprices of their owners. The real motive of this submission, viz. the fear of the Lord, is also found in the parallel Eph. vi 5 ff. = Col. iii 22, but Peter is not simply quoting here (a special group, not the δοῦλοι in general, are addressed; an admonition to the masters is missing!). The point here is: What should be the behaviour in being ill-treated on wrong grounds? The writer is specially concerned with the πασχεῖν of the slaves, and has not in view the situation under their masters in general, but under the crooked, perverse (a word rarely applied to persons according to Liddell-Scott, s.v., but cf. Acts ii 40, Phil. ii 15). If a slave

makes a mistake (ἀμαρτάνω) and is buffeted for that, he cannot complain, for that is his due; he cannot either claim glory in the eyes of God. But if he does well and is punished he finds favour in God's eyes. Ἀγαθοποιῶντες is the contrast of ἀμαρτάνοντες, but it implies more than "doing one's duty" (Selwyn). It stands also parallel with διὰ συνείδησιν Θεοῦ = in compliance with the will of God;¹⁸ it may be by refusing to obey a command contrary to the will of God (murder, theft, idolatry). In that case one finds favour with God (χάρις; thanks which one did not receive from the furious master, but from God, and at the same time, God's grace; just as ἀμαρτία in this passage is used with a double meaning "fault" and "sin"). The fact that the master is σκολιός makes his eye closed so that he does not see the "well-doing" and punishes his slave. The slave must find his example in Christ (cf. Phil. ii 7 μορφὴν δούλου λαβών?), for two reasons: (a) Christ suffered though he had done no wrong by deed or word, not even during his Passion, but completely trusted in the righteous judgement of God; (b) Christ set the Christians free from ἀμαρτία to live for righteousness.

c) iii 1-6. The exhortation to Christian wives to be submissive like Eph. v 22-4, Col. iii 18 and 1 Tim. ii 9-15, but with another motive and taking into account that some are married with unbelievers which gives a special turn to the passage. The standard of their way of living is formulated here in accordance with the ideals current in the ancient world.¹⁹ Three points deserve notice: (1) the fact that the chaste behaviour in the fear of the Lord may in itself without words be winning²⁰ those who do not obey the word of God; (2) the incorruptible beauty as against the outward and vanishing apparel having an everlasting character (cf. i 4, 23) consists in a meek and quiet spirit which is "in the sight of God of great price"; (3) the ladies are called Sarah's daughters, probably because she was the mother of the women-proselytes. The passage ends with the words: ἀγαθοποιῶσαι καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν. This clause is not conditional (so Windisch), because that would make no sense. It must either be taken as parallel to ὑποτασσόμεναι (v. 5) or as an independent phrase, a participle with the

¹⁸ Cf. my discussion of this word in *1 Clement 34 and the "Sanctus"*, in *Vigiliae Christianae*, V (1951), pp. 321-34, to appear in *Sparsa Collecta* III.

¹⁹ N. Geurts, *Het Huwelijk bij de Griekse en Romeinse Moralisten* (Amsterdam, 1928; diss. Utrecht), pp. 91 ff.

²⁰ Cf. D. Daube, *κερδαίνω as a missionary term*, in *Harvard Theol. Rev.* XL (1947), pp. 109 ff.

force of an imperative, as is often found in this Epistle.²¹ But in either case it fixes the rule for the Christian ladies. Since the latter half is found in Prov. iii 25 it may be that ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι is derived from v. 27 μὴ ἀπόσχῃ εὖ ποιεῖν ἐνδεῇ, meaning: charitable to the poor. But since these verses deal with the relation between husband and wife, it seems out of place to bring in the poor and advisable to give the word the wider meaning: being a good wife in every respect, impeccable, full of love without fear (for repudiation and other sufferings cf. v. 17).

d) iii 8-22. In vv. 8-9 a the writer sums up what should be the rule of life for all Christians: "be ye all likeminded, compassionate, loving as brethren, tenderhearted, humbleminded; not rendering evil for evil or reviling for reviling, but contrariwise blessing". To this they are called, which he proves by quoting Ps. xxxiv 13-17. Future blessedness will fall to those who do not speak guile, who turn from evil and do good (ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν), seek for peace, because God is inclined to the righteous, but is angry with the evil-doers (ποιοῦντας κακά). This Scripture was well-adapted to his purpose, since it combined an outlook on eternal life with ethical demands in the present and the comfort of God's help for the righteous with menace towards evil-doers. If there is this promise of God, who will do any harm to these "zealots" of the good? For the good will be recognized by all men, but even if that is not so, God is on their side and will give them His blessing. This is the meaning of vv. 13-14, the latter verse reminding us of Jesus' saying in Matt. v 10. There is a chance of suffering: διὰ δικαιοσύνην. Δικαιοσύνη here as in ii 24 is a designation of the status of Christians who have broken with evil; it is not only human justice, but as is clear from the frequent expression εὐσεβής or ὁσιος καὶ δίκαιος, it is the right behaviour toward men according to the second table of the Law.²² In that case, the writer says, they should not fear but remain faithful to their Lord Christ and give account of their hope with meekness and fear of the Lord in their answer and take care that they are in all things conscious of accordance with God's command in order that their good Christian behaviour puts to shame their slanderers. The basis for this is the *adagium*, that if the will of

²¹ As was shown in the well-known "Appended Note, Participle and Imperative in 1 Peter" by D. Daube, *ap. Selwyn, Commentary*, pp. 467 ff.

²² A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus* (Gütersloh, 1932), p. 37 and Kittel, *loc. cit.* pp. 195-6.

God brings suffering, it is better to bear it while "doing good" than while "doing evil", for in the latter case it will be well-deserved while in the former one remains faithful to God's standard and gets his reward. This saying is proved by the Passion of Christ their own Saviour²³ who being righteous gave himself for the unrighteous whose death was even a preaching to people who had been disobedient²⁴ and shares now the glory of God. As in ii 21 ff. Christ is the example, although the word is not used here.

e) iv 12-19. This passage has always been the sheet-anchor for the connexion of this letter with the persecution of the Christians by the state. It is stated that here the sufferings are not spoken of as mere possibilities but as grim fact. Some years ago Dr Selwyn argued that it is not possible to relate the facts of this Epistle with the information about the early persecutions.²⁵ Knopf revealed the difficulty of the usual explanation in commenting on p. 186: "Die Stelle klingt so ernst, als ob das blutige Martyrium, der Einsatz des Lebens hier vorausgesetzt und gefördert würde. Dagegen spricht indeß ἐν ἀγαθοποιῇ, das ein weiteres Leben im Fleische voraussetzt." This discrepancy puts before us the question whether one of the terms of the comparison may be wrong. If so it cannot be the latter; so there is a feasibility that the supposition of persecution and martyrdom by the state is a mistake. As a matter of fact I am convinced that we have to leave out the whole thought of state action. The following reasons seem conclusive: (1) the writer never speaks of the death of the Christians but of their sufferings (ii 19-20; iii 13, 17; iv 1 and iv 13, 15) and this πάσχειν is a very painful experience but not death, as is shown by the example of the slaves, of the thieves, while he clearly distinguishes Christ's suffering and death; (2) it is said that the same sufferings are shared by the whole brotherhood (v 9), therefore it must be something quite different from local persecutions; (3) the accusations mentioned in this Epistle are slander of Christian behaviour and reproach for the name of Christian, there being not a word about intervention by the state; the people do speak evil of the Christians (iv 6), because they do not join in the usual pleasures. Whoever

²³ For the "technical" meaning of προσάγειν, see p. 55.

²⁴ The word ἀπειθεῖν is also a key-word of the Epistle, being used in ii 7-8; iii 1, 20 and iv 17.

²⁵ E. G. Selwyn, *The Persecutions in 1 Peter*, in *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, Bulletin, 1950 (Oxford, pp. 39-50).

has lived in a small and closed community knows how a person belonging to a certain group outside that community and bearing a somewhat strange name may be branded and have to undergo all the sufferings of an outcast. Nothing more is said, but it is, I should think, sufficient.

Because of their struggling against the stream—one thinks of the Christians abstaining from the pagan cults and not living according to the ἀναστροφή πατροπαράδοτος (i 18)—their faith in Christ is fiercely tested (i 6-7; iv 12), but the writer says that they should not think it strange, a topic of proselyte-instruction.²⁶ The special point as distinct from the former passages is: the Christian name. It should be a reason for rejoicing, since sharing in the sufferings of Christ also means sharing in his glory.²⁷ And whereas he speaks in vv. 17-18 about the coming judgement of God, these sufferings belong to the θλίψεις through which they have to pass before entering into the kingdom of God (cf. Acts xiv 22).²⁸ Again he warns his readers that they should not be suffering as ordinary criminals,²⁹ but suffering for the Christian name is not a reason for shame, on the contrary for praise to God, because it is the name of their Saviour. In iv 19 he comes to his conclusion that they who suffer according to the will of God, since the θλίψεις preceding the judgement belong to the plan of God, must commit their souls unto the faithful Creator, that is unto Him who brings about the new world and can be trusted.³⁰ This they must do ἐν ἀγαθοποιίᾳ = while doing good to men and living an excellent life; this is clear from the opposite in verse 15. These are the relationships of the Christian life.

f) ii 12. At this verse most commentators refer to the word of Jesus (Matt. v 16), "even so let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven". That is an interesting parallel indeed though it does not account for every feature of this text. Grave difficulties are offered

²⁶ Cf. p. 66 f.

²⁷ Cf. Rom. viii 17; 2 Tim. ii 12.

²⁸ Cf. H. Schlier, in Kittel, *loc.cit.* vol. III, pp. 142 ff.

²⁹ Κακοποιός must have here a more specialized meaning than in ii 12 and 14, since it stands in the same line with κλέπτης and φονεύς, thus "sorcerer", as is given by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*⁹ (Oxford, 1940), vol. I, p. 862 b.

³⁰ The *hapax legomenon* in the N.T. κτίστης here is somewhat peculiar. With due hesitation and with reference to ii 23 I would suggest the conjecture κριτῆ.

by the last words ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς. For what does that mean? Some take it in an eschatological sense: on the day of the final visitation, others—and they are as far as I can see in the majority—think of the moment in which the pagans come into real contact with the Gospel and are won for Christianity. It seems as though these words are fairly unimportant so that they can be missed altogether. Holtzmann wrote: “Nach ii 12, iii 16 sind insonderheit alle Anstößigkeiten des Lebens zu vermeiden, um jenen praktischen Beweis für die Wahrheit und Göttlichkeit des Christentums nicht zu lähmen, welchen die Gläubigen angesichts einer heidnischen Welt durch ihren Wandel (ebenso iii 1-2) führen sollen (vgl. Matt. v 16)”.³¹ That would be right were it not for the last words. Before making our decision we notice two points: (a) that the oldest direct quotations of the text in Clem. Alex. and Cypr. leave out these words; did they give some trouble? (b) the word ἐπισκοπή is also found in a variant reading of v 6 ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ; this is the reading generally adopted, but some MSS. and translations add: ἐπισκοπῆς; this word is not inserted in the text of the modern editions because of weaker attestation, preference for the shorter text and assumed influence from ii 12. But is there not a possibility that it originally belonged to the text and was dropped? A good number of MSS. which have the better reading in v 12 support ἐπισκοπῆς, as appears from Tischendorf's apparatus; there seems to have been a tendency to skip over the words (see (a)); ἐν καιρῷ is a good Greek expression in itself, so the word ἐπισκοπῆς could be missed (the exalting taking place at some time in the future), while in ii 12 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ would be nonsense; this text is not a parallel to ii 12, so what could have urged some scribe to insert the word? These arguments lead me to think that the reading ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς is the right one.³² If this is true we find the interesting fact that here again we have a text parallel to a word of Jesus (Matt. xxiii 12; Luke xiv 11, xviii 14) with an addition “at the time of the ἐπισκοπή”. Now it is evident that the interpretation of ἐπισκοπῆς in v 6 as: when they

³¹ H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*² (Tübingen, 1911), vol. II, p. 358.

³² While the fact of later insertion has never been explained so far except by the wrong assumption that v 6 is influenced by ii 12, the waning of the eschatological feeling—on the eschatological content of ἐπισκοπή see below—duly accounts for the omission of the word, a clear case of “dogmatical” correction.

are visited by God who brings them into touch with the Gospel, yields sheer nonsense. People who already are Christians are addressed and admonished to humbleness, because God will exalt them in the time of the *parousia*, a thought in perfect accordance with the whole teaching of this Epistle that suffering in this world will soon be followed by glory. The waning of the eschatological hope duly accounts for its being dropped, opening the door to all sorts of misinterpretations. Or it may be that some scribe remembering Luke xix 44 (Jesus' word to Jerusalem) did not think it fitted in this connexion of 1 Peter. On the other hand *καιρός* is used in this Epistle in an eschatological sense (i 5; iv 17).

In the present discussion we cannot start from this text of Luke xix 44, Jerusalem shall be destroyed "because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation" (cf. Luke i 68-70), since there it is connected with Jesus' coming which in itself is an eschatological act, but that is different from the preaching of the Gospel, and from 1 Pet. iv 17 it is clear that the message is met with disobedience.

The word *ἐπισκοπή* is typical for the LXX³³ where it can have a general meaning of visitation, care, searching. Our text repeats a word from Isa. x 3 directed against people who act unjustly: *τί ποιήσουσιν ἐν ἡμέραις τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς; ἡ γὰρ θλίψις ὑμῶν πόρρωθεν ἔξει.* A similar expression in Jer. vi 15 *διὰ τοῦτο (sin) πεσοῦνται ἐν τῇ πτώσει αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπολοῦνται* or x 15, *vain are the works of delusion (images of idols) ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπολοῦνται.* Here it is clearly eschatological, the day of final judgement. In his *Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* Volz has pointed out that this word is a technical term for the final act of God's coming, bringing damnation to the wicked and salvation to the righteous. The numerous examples he adduces can be supplemented with a reference to the *Manual of Discipline* of the Dead Sea Scrolls and to the Jewish liturgy of New Year's Day with its strong eschatological note.³⁴ In 1 Clem. l 3 it is also clearly eschatological where it is connected with the kingdom of Christ (the righteous οἱ φανερωθήσονται ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ). The "visitation" is God's intervention with a final character, connected with general judgement in later Jewish theology "for

³³ Cf. H. W. Beyer, in Kittel, *loc. cit.* vol. II, p. 602.

³⁴ P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*² (Tübingen, 1934), pp. 164-5; see also *Manual of Discipline*, ed. W. H. Brownlee, iii 18, iv 19.

better, for worse". There is no reason to suppose that it is "der Tag der individuellen Heimsuchung, der zur Bekehrung führt" (Windisch, p. 62). Ἡμέρα also has that eschatological connotation in the N.T.³⁵ This interpretation of ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς as the day of the *parousia* is fully in keeping with the whole strongly eschatological setting of the Epistle.

The main verb in this part of the verse is δοξάσωσιν; this aor. subj. dependent on ἵνα has the meaning of a future as in v 6. This praise will take place at the day when God comes to "visit" the earth and its inhabitants. There is nothing said of the conversion of the Gentiles, only of their praise. The phrasing is here decidedly different from that in iii 1, two cases which are too readily identified. In *Test. XII Patr., Naphtali* viii 4 it is said: "If ye work that is good, my children, both men and angels shall bless you; and God shall be glorified among the Gentiles through you". This sounds very much like our text, but there the eschatological background is missing, it takes place on the earth; the thought that Israel must do things in order that the name of God may not be blasphemed but praised, is also found elsewhere.³⁶ But the idea that the nations will praise the Lord is found in several places: in *Test. Judah* xxv 5 after the resurrection of the dead Israel will rejoice and "all the nations shall glorify the Lord for ever"; in Ps. lxxxvi 9, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ὅσα ἐποίησας ἥξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιόν σου, Κύριε, καὶ δοξάσουσιν τὸ ὄνομά σου: in Enoch lxii-lxiii, a description of the judgement over the kings and mighty men is given in which they bless and glorify and extol the Son of Man who comes forth from his hiding-place (lxii 6); they say: "Blessed is the Lord of Spirits and the Lord of the Kings, and the Lord of the mighty and the Lord of the rich and the Lord of glory and the Lord of wisdom, and splendid in every secret thing is Thy power from generation to generation . . . deep are all Thy secrets and innumerable, and Thy righteousness is beyond reckoning. We have now learnt that we should glorify and bless the Lord of kings . . . would that we had rest to glorify and give thanks and confess our faith before His glory", but they do not find that time, for they are condemned (ch. lxiii); the 'Alenu-prayer³⁷ expresses the hope of God's coming

³⁵ P. L. Schoonheim, *Een semasiologisch onderzoek van Parousia* (Aalten, 1953; diss. Utrecht), pp. 35 ff.

³⁶ Cf. Billerbeck, *loc. cit.* vol. III, p. 118 ad Rom. ii 24.

³⁷ Text of C. G. Montefiore, *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings*

kingdom "when Thou wilt turn unto Thyself the wicked of the earth; let all the inhabitants of the world perceive and know that unto Thee every knee must bow and every tongue must swear; before Thee, O Lord our God, let them bow and fall; and unto Thy glorious name let them give honour". Interesting in this respect is the commentary in *Midrash Tehillim*, Ps. lxvii 6 (tr. of Wünsche, p. 346), "Preisen werden dich Völker . . . Warum? Weil der Heilige, gepr. sei er! die Gerechtigkeit der Israeliten ans Licht treten läßt"; proof-text is Ps. xxxvii 6, "und er läßt hervorgehen wie Licht deine Gerechtigkeit". This explanation is relevant for our passage.

The sentences of ii 11-12 are the heading of the whole ethical part of the letter, in which the "Haustafel" in part is incorporated. The Christians, reborn by the Word of God, must abstain from fleshly lusts, because they fight against the soul, i.e. fiercely try to prevent them from reaching the ultimate goal, the salvation of their souls (i 9). These fleshly lusts belong to the state from which they have been freed (cf. ch. i 13-ii 9 and iv 2 ff.). They are now called to show forth the excellencies (virtues) of their God (ii 9). This new behaviour makes the pagans wonder and they call the Christians "evil-doers" in a general sense (contrast iv 15). The writer admonishes them to live a seemly life (*καλός*, which can be noticed), "in order that they, when ³⁸ they revile you as evil-doers, on account of (*ἐκ*) the good works (= *καλὴ ἀναστροφή*) which they now behold, may glorify God in the day of visitation", because then the "righteousness" (iii 14) will be manifest to all and the glory of God in whose service the Christians did their works will be revealed before all eyes.

After this analysis a more systematic summary will be useful. The writer often uses the words *ἀγαθοποιέω*, *καλὴ ἀναστροφή*, *καλὰ ἔργα* which determine the course of his expositions. It cannot be said why he does not use other synonyms like *εὖ ποιεῖν*, *εὐεργετεῖν*; it may be that they had some connotation which made it less advisable to employ them. He is always dealing with the same sort of situation in which the Christians are, but every passage has a different aspect: in ii 12, iii 16 the Christians are blamed as "evil-doers", in iv 15 they are reviled for the name "Christians"; in ii 12

(London, 1930), p. 131. The Pseudepigrapha are quoted from Charles' translation.

³⁸ B. Reicke, *loc. cit.* pp. 110 f.

and iii 16 the claim of doing good is accounted for in a different way.

The letter gives the Christian teaching on perseverance in "doing good" even amidst suffering. The end, the judgement is at hand; therefore they must be watchful. They live in the short time between the death and resurrection of Christ and the "visitation". Set free by the work of Christ from the πατροπαράδοτος ἀναστροφή and the desire of the Gentiles they belong to the people of God. Therefore they are in a time of παροιμία (i 17), are strangers (iv 4), but they have to live according to the command of the holy God in holiness, in fear of the Lord, the well-known expression from the O.T. For God will judge "according to each man's work" (i 17) and in Ps. xxxiv it is clearly set before them what are the conditions: to abstain from evil and to do good. It may be that their status as πάροικοι brings with it suffering, for their faith is put to a hard test (i 6; iv 12) and it may even be according to the will of God their life-rule (ii 15, iv 2, iii 17, iv 19; cf. i 6), for these things belong to the θλίψεις which, as is taught in the Gospels and Paul, will precede the end. But suffering with Christ also means sharing in His glory. This suffering—it may be said in passing—has no worth in itself, as in Judaism, where it might bring atonement, for sins have been borne by Christ (ii 24). Just as in John's Gospel the disciples are hated because they are not of the world, but are chosen by Christ (xv 18-xvi 4), so it is here. "Do well and prosper" does not apply here in this world and in this time, but that fact would be a strong temptation. Therefore this strong appeal not to fashion themselves according to their former lusts in the time of their ignorance (i 14; cf. ii 11; iii 3; iv 3), to abstain from retaliation (ii 22; iii 9), against haughtiness, in short: a strong appeal against everything in which the Christian would serve himself. The main trend of thought, however, is not negative, but positive: to do good, to behave seemly, for to be treated unjustly is better than to act unjustly.

In every respect the relation with fellow-men is central, not a retreat from the world, but a life in the given conditions. All that can do harm to the neighbour in deed and word must be avoided and his good must be sought after. Those who have come to the liberty of Christ have put away all wickedness, guile, hypocrisies, envies and evil-speaking (ii 1); those who have sanctified themselves, are called to unfeigned love of the brethren (ii 22), to meekness and humility (iii 4, 15; v. 6). In iii 8-9 and iv 8-10 this demand is elaborated more fully: "be ye all likeminded, loving as brethren,

tenderhearted, humbleminded, not rendering evil for evil, or reviling for reviling, but contrariwise blessing"; "above all things [viz. with regard to their personal watchfulness] being fervent in your love among yourselves; . . . using hospitality one to another without murmuring, according as each has received a gift, ministering it among yourselves as good stewards of the manifold grace of God". But it is clear enough that the mutual love of the Christians among themselves is not the only form of good works. They are also extended to outsiders: in subjection to the state authorities, to masters in performing one's duty, to husbands even if they are unbelieving. These ethical demands can easily be paralleled from the moral teaching of pagan philosophers. They correspond to the highest standard of a decent man or woman in the ancient world, though the demand of humility (ταπεινοφροσύνη) runs counter to Hellenistic thought and important things like παιδεία are left out of sight, due of course to the social status of Christians. One would have expected the word καλοκάγαθία in the course of the letter. At any rate it is supposed that the outsiders can see this goodness and acknowledge it as right. No special "Christian", but truly human, ethics are demanded.

These good works have no place in the process of salvation. The work Christ has done is the unshakable basis in the relation with God. It has sometimes been thought that iv 8, "love covereth a multitude of sins", meant one's own sins, that it was an explanation why Christians should love one another (one notes the interesting variant: καλύψει, fut.). But that interpretation is not right. It is a quotation from Prov. x 12 (not quite according to the LXX, but Hebr. *pasha'* is sometimes translated by ἁμαρτία), where it has a bearing upon human relationships. ἁμαρτία is used in 1 Peter with a double meaning: (a) sin against God (iv 1) and (b) fault against men (ii 20, 22); here it must have the second meaning, since sins against God are taken away by Christ (ii 24; iv 2). This part of iv 8 explains what is implied in the love towards the brethren which must be ἐκτενής = assiduous (cf. i 22): not to find fault with one another, but to cover their mistakes (cf. 1 Cor. xiii 7). The following clause shows that Christian people followed the commandments of love with aloofness. "Tout comme chez nous". It is nowhere said that good works count as righteousness with God, that they bring atonement or special reward. To be sure, it is suggested by ii 20 that suffering may give κλέος and in i 7 the trial

of their faith will "redound to praise and glory and honour" (so R.S.V.), but that does not mean that they are a reward for their good works; it means that they impart the glory which is given by Christ; in this world discipleship implies contumely, but in the *parousia* it turns out to be a reason for praise. This doing of good works as an expression of Christian holiness follows from God's calling (ii 21; iii 9), because the Lord himself is holy (i 16; ii 5, 9). Christ, their Redeemer, has himself set the example for doing good even amidst suffering (cf. Acts x 38 Jesus went about doing good, part of the *kerygma*).³⁹ There is no relation to the Torah or to supererogatory deeds. It follows all from the summing up of the Law: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (cf. Rom. xiii 9). It serves to win others (iii 1-2), to stop the calumniation (ii 15; iii 16), and the ultimate glorification of God (ii 12).

If we now return to our starting-point with the three possible interpretations of "good works", viz. the "Greek", "Jewish" and "Christian" and ask to which type Peter's conception is related, we find that it is closely alike to the first one but for its foundation.

It is decidedly different from the Jewish type, since the "good deeds" are not special works towards the poor, the dead, etc., like the *gemiluth chasidim*, have no special value for the acquirement of God's favour, but are extended to all without exception. Neither are they like the later "Christian" conception expressions of piety; they are not "ecclesiastical", but secular and have no atoning value for post-baptismal sins. This "holiness" does not express itself in prayer, almsgiving and penitence, but in the right behaviour towards the neighbour, be he Christian or not; they are not done for heaven's sake, but for neighbour's sake.

A close inspection brings to light that Peter uses the word ἀγαθοποιεῖν and its derivatives with the same range of meaning as was usual among the "Greeks". There is the same width in it as in the Pauline saying: "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue and if there be any praise, think on these things" (Phil. iv 8).

But the foundation is quite different from the Greek: God's

³⁹ C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, new edit. (London, 1944), pp. 27 f.

calling and not human goodness; and its aim is different: not to earn glory for oneself, but to make the way free for the Gospel towards the disobedient. It is remarkable to find in 1 Peter this typical "Greek" word used side by side with typical O.T. words like φόβος, ἄγιος (ἁγνός), but was there anything against using it as an expression of the idea "love thy neighbour as thyself"? On the contrary the term expressing a Greek ideal in itself was very apt for its Christian use. It was not a thought introduced for apologetic reasons, but a word that could convey the Christian message.

The way in which it is applied throws an interesting light upon the problem of the so-called "Interims-ethik". The eschatological note is very strong (cf. pp. 91, 98 f.), but there is nothing here of special radical demands because the end is near. Before the coming *parousia* they have to live as the finest of men. In a time when "the love of the many shall wax cold" (Matt. xxiv 12), because of the growing iniquities, the Christians have to be "zealots of the good".

This leads to another observation. Grundmann⁴⁰ has argued that this usage of Peter was on the same line as the Pastoral epistles in which the expression καλὰ ἔργα is very marked. In this connexion he says that it comes from Hellenistic-Jewish circles, shows Jewish influence and that the use of καλός originating from the "durch die Gedanken stoischer Ethik geformten Vulgärsprache" is a clear witness of the attitude of the Christian churches of the second generation, "vor denen eben die große Frage der Bewährung stand", and of its solution. A similar line is taken by Dibelius, when he wrote (in summing up the arguments for the spuriousness of the Pastorals): "es handelt sich um ein Christentum der rechten Lehre und der guten Werke: eine als Gemeindebesitz vorausgesetzte Dogmatik und eine bürgerliche Ethik verbinden sich zu einem durchaus *statischen Christentum*, in dem von der dynamischen Gespanntheit des eschatologischen Evangeliums des Paulus nichts zu finden ist", and later: "Einflüsse jüdischer Paränese mögen dabei mitwirken, aber sie würden nicht aufgenommen werden, wenn die rationale, auf ein verchristlichtes Leben abzielende Auffassung des Christentums sie nicht begünstigte".⁴¹ It would take us too far, if we were to discuss the relation of 1 Peter to the Pastoral

⁴⁰ W. Grundmann, in Kittel, *loc. cit.* vol. III, pp. 551-3.

⁴¹ M. Dibelius, *Die Pastoralbriefe*² (Tübingen, 1931), pp. 3, 29, cf. pp. 24-5; see also H. Preisker, *Das Ethos des Urchristentums* (Gütersloh, 1949), pp. 195 ff.

Epistles and the ethical attitude of the Pastorals in itself. But I think that the quotations are even without that connexion relevant to our subject. They do need a radical revision, because they are at complete variance with the real facts. Jewish influence was not found at this point; eschatology was very tense; every missionary can tell that the problem of the "Bewährung" is not one of the second generation, but starts at the very beginning of the convert's Christian life. The problem of N.T. ethics cannot so easily be solved by dismissing the "good works" to the second generation. Here is an unpermitted short cut. The relation of Christianity and the existing order, of faith and works, of rebirth and the present life are far more complicated than is suggested in the above quotations. And equally important would it be to investigate the causes which brought about the transition from 1 Peter's conception to that found in Chrysostom.

Where did Peter get the idea from? A comparison with Paul cannot be carried through in the compass of this article. Let me quote two sentences of his genuine Epistles only: "But ye, brethren, be not weary in well-doing" (2 Thess. iii. 13) and "let us not be weary in well-doing . . . so then, as we have opportunity, let us work that which is good toward all men, especially toward them that are of the household of the faith" (Gal. vi 9-10). This parallelism shows how deeply the thought expressed by Peter entered into the Christian teaching.

In my opinion it goes back to and is a legitimate consequence from the teaching of Jesus. There are remarkable reminiscences of the Synoptic Gospels in this letter. In this case it does not seem advisable, however, to refer to Luke vi 33-5 where ἀγαθοποιέω is used twice in a word of Jesus, because it is missing in the parallel Matt. v 43 ff. and may be due to the wording of Luke. But Jesus' teaching of what was meant by the neighbour in the summary of the law "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" in the Parable of the Good Samaritan, his intercourse with publicans, his Passion must have made a deep impression. This combined with the wondrous certainty of salvation, the necessity of refuting the calumnies by deeds and of impressing the great commandment upon men and women in suffering for their Christian faith, completely account for this form of teaching which found a Greek word perfectly adequate to express how a Christian has to live with his fellow-men in love during this time of faith and hope.

A CLASSICAL PARALLEL TO
1 PETER II 14 AND 20 *

In my paper "The Teaching of Good Works in 1 Peter" (in this volume p. 83-105), I discussed the passages in which Peter exhorts his readers to ἀγαθοποιῆα, which is a keynote in his ethical instruction, and tried to define the contents of this idea. An interesting parallel to expressions used by Peter in this connexion, drawn from a classical author, leads me to write a short supplementary note. As far as I can ascertain, this parallel has escaped the attention of commentators. It came of late to my notice quite unexpectedly, offering a welcome confirmation of the argument in my paper.

In 1 Peter ii 20 it is said:

ποῖον γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ.

The general line of this exhortation to the house-slaves is quite clear, but the text as it stands calls for several observations:

1. κλέος is a hapax legomenon in the N.T.¹ and in classical Greek it has a somewhat poetical flavour, its frequent occurrence in Homer being well known.²

2. The contrast underlying this verse is that between ἁμαρτάνοντες and ἀγαθοποιοῦντες. Suffering following the former is well deserved and no claim to glory; suffering following the latter is more than κλέος, it is χάρις παρὰ θεῶ. But what do these contrasting verbs mean? Should the former word be translated as "to make a mistake" or "to sin" and the latter as "to do well" or "to do a specially good deed"?

3. The verse, which has no parallel in the other N.T. passages about slaves, comes in somewhat unexpectedly. Weidinger made the comment: "(es) klingt sehr vulgär und könnte dem Kynismus entstammen",³ but this statement is made without any support

* Appeared in *New Test. Studies* 2, 1956, p. 198-202.

¹ It is found only twice in the LXX (Job xxviii 22, xxx 8) and has not been incorporated in Kittel's *Wörterbuch*.

² Cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*⁹ (Oxford, 1940), vol. I, p. 958 a.

³ K. Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln* (Leipzig, 1928), p. 64.

from classical authors, so that it is nothing more than a guess.

4. The verse belongs not only to a special form of instruction to the slaves, but to a wider complex of ethical commandments ii 13-iii 6, which is characterized by ὑποτάσσω under given authorities and ἀγαθοποιέω in these circumstances.

The last observation leads us to see a certain agreement between ii 20 and a verse in the preceding paragraph, v. 14 εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν, ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν. κλέος is closely connected with ἔπαινος.⁴ We find the following parallelism in thought: a) suffering after ἁμαρτία does not give κλέος, because the punishment is well deserved (v. 20), ἐκδίκησις κακοποιῶν (v. 14); b) suffering after ἀγαθοποιῶν gives χάρις παρὰ θεῶ, because it is not only undeserved, but on the contrary ἀγαθοποιῶν deserves praise (v. 20), ἔπαινος ἀγαθοποιῶν (v. 14).

That rulers are sent to punish evil-doers is quite obvious, but that they are sent to "praise well-doers" is not so clear in itself. The latter expression can only mean a special mark of distinction which cannot be applied to people who simply live according to the laws, but has in view special people, viz. benefactors. It is well known that this was the case in Greek and Hellenistic communities; there were honours-lists for those who had done great services to their town or state.⁵ This was specifically Greek and not Jewish, as appears from Josephus, *contra Apionem*, II, § 217 who, clearly in view of the Greek practices, says about the Jews:

τοῖς μέντοι γε νομίμως βιοῦσι γέρας ἔστιν οὐκ ἄργυρος οὐδὲ χρυσός, οὐ κοτίνου στέφανος ἢ σελίνου καὶ τοιαύτη τις ἀνακήρυξις, ἀλλ', κτλ.

It may also be remarked that the parallelism between vv. 12 and 14 (κακοποιῶν . . . ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων//κακοποιῶν . . . ἀγαθοποιῶν) leads to an equalization between καλὰ ἔργα and ἀγαθοποιέω.

The paragraph on submission to the state-authorities is also found in Rom. xiii 1 ff. But is this a typically Christian sentiment? From the commentaries on Rom. xiii one might draw that conclusion, since no parallels from Greek or Roman authors are given.

⁴ Plato, *Leges* 633 A uses both words together. ἔπαινος is more the good report or fame, κλέος praise—ἔπαινος could not be used in this connexion because the master of the slave cannot be supposed to praise the man he ill-treats.

⁵ Cf. G. Gerlach, *Griechische Ehreninschriften* (Halle, 1908), and A. J. Festugière, *Le monde gréco-romain au temps de notre Seigneur* (Paris, 1935), vol. II, p. 197.

It is often suggested that this definition of the Christian attitude towards the state is Paul's own invention. A close comparison between Rom. xiii and 1 Pet. ii 13 ff. shows, however, that Peter is not dependent on Paul, as is often thought, but that both are reproducing a generally accepted form of teaching in their own way. This raises the question whence it was derived. We shall keep the point of the *ἔπαινος* specially in view.

Preisker has argued that *ἔπαινος* in these passages is not the "charakteristisches Lebensideal des antiken Menschen", as in Phil. iv 8, but "solche Anerkennung, (die) durch Beauftragte Gottes ausgesprochen wird".⁶ This he thinks so important that he prints the words in italics. But does this hold good? In my opinion Preisker has made the mistake of defining "praise" by the expression *διὰ τὸν κύριον* in v. 13 and in this way comes to his conclusion. This, however, seems to me to be a wrong exegesis, because *διὰ τὸν κύριον* qualifies the verb *ὑποτάγητε*, while the clause *εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν* depends upon the preceding *δι' αὐτοῦ (βασιλέως) πεμπομένοις*. I fail to see here any specifically Christian content in the word *ἔπαινος* or any difference from Phil. iv 8. This is confirmed by the parallel to which I should like to draw attention.

The Greek historian Diodorus Siculus, who wrote his *Universal History* between 60 and 30 B.C.,⁷ says in xv, 1, 1:

παρ' ὅλην τὴν πραγματείαν εἰωθότες χρῆσθαι τῇ συνήθει τῆς ἱστορίας παρρησιᾶ⁸ καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐπὶ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων τὸν δίκαιον ἐπιλέγειν *ἔπαινον*, τοὺς δὲ φαύλους, ὅταν *ἐξαμαρτάνωσιν*, ἀξιοῦν δικαίας *ἐπιτιμῆσεως*.

In somewhat different terms he expresses the same idea in xi, 46, 1:

ἡμεῖς δὲ παρ' ὅλην τὴν ἱστορίαν εἰωθότες τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν διὰ τῶν ἐπιλεγόμενων ἐπαίνων αὖξιν τὴν δόξαν, τοῖς δὲ φαύλοις ἐπὶ τῆς τελευτῆς ἐπιφθέγγεσθαι τὰς ἀρμοζούσας βλασφημίας.

Scheller⁹ shows that this was a special characteristic of Greek historiography and supposed that this particular thought was

⁶ H. Preisker, in G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.* (Stuttgart, 1935), vol. II, pp. 583-4.

⁷ Cf. *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1949), p. 284, s.v.

⁸ Cf. the expression in 2 Cor. iii 12.

⁹ P. Scheller, *De hellenistica historiae conscribendae arte* (diss. Leipzig, 1911), pp. 48-50.

derived from Ephorus in the fourth century B.C.¹⁰ Though the context is quite different, the phraseology is strikingly similar, as may be clear from the words I have underlined.¹¹ The historian, according to Diodorus, must not only give a true report of the events just as they happened, but also praise virtues and blame misdeeds. After having read what Diodorus has to say upon the supreme task of historiography,¹² one does not wonder at the similarity between the function of the historian and those in authority. Both must educate the people and bring them by all means εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν either by punishing the wicked or by giving distinctions to the good. History is also a school-master.

The parallelism between the expressions in Diodorus and in 1 Peter is too striking to be merely accidental. On the other hand it cannot be explained by the supposition that the Christian author had read Diodorus. Somewhere there must be a link which is probably to be found in Greek popular philosophy, which was fond of such antithetical expressions.¹³ One may suppose that somebody has formulated the duty of state-authorities, as found in the N.T., and that this maxim was applied by Diodorus or even Ephorus to

¹⁰ Cf. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, p. 319, s.v.

¹¹ The difference between ἐκδίκησις and ἐπιτιμήσις is unimportant; in fact both words define the same action, but since history does not possess the *ius gladii*, ἐκδίκησις could not be used by Diodorus.

¹² English readers will find a convenient translation of Diodorus' Introduction to his *Universal History* in A. J. Toynbee, *Greek Historical Thought*, from which I quote a few lines: "Ordinary men are transformed by it (history) into leaders; men born to command are stimulated by the immortality of fame which it confers to embark upon noble enterprises; soldiers, again, are encouraged by the posthumous glory which it promises to risk their lives for their country; the wicked are deterred by the eternal obloquy with which it threatens them for their evil impulses; and in general, the good graces of History are so highly praised that some have been stimulated by the hope of them to become founders of states, others to introduce laws contributing to the security of the race, and others to make scientific or practical discoveries by which all mankind has benefited . . . History may claim to be the guardian of those who have a reputation to keep, the witness against those who have a reputation to lose . . . History is also the mistress of eloquence, the gift of gifts. Eloquence raises the Hellene above the non-Hellene and the educated above the illiterate, and it is the only weapon which enables one man to prevail against many . . . Know her (History) by her fruits, and you will find her making for righteousness, denouncing evil, eulogizing the good, and, in a word, endowing those who study her with the sum of human wisdom".

¹³ Cf. B. A. van Groningen, *De antithese als Griekse denkvorm*, in *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België*, Klasse der Letteren, Jaargang XV (1953), no. 1.

the servant of Clio. This missing link I must confess I have not found yet.

It seems evident to me that the terminology of 1 Peter is derived here from Greek sources and should be interpreted accordingly. That is to say: in v. 20 ἀμαρτάνω means "to make a mistake" and ἀγαθοποιέω is not only to do one's duty, but "to do a specially praiseworthy deed". It shows once more that Peter, as was set out in my previous paper, was moving, with this terminology about "good works", in the Greek sphere.

If this argument is sound, it opens some new lines of thought with regard to the concept of the state in the N.T. and helps to a better estimation of the ways in which Greek ethical ideas were adopted by the early Christians.

A more general lesson may be drawn from this example of a Hellenistic-Greek illustration of a N.T. text. As was said before, this phrase of Diodorus has not been adduced in the commentaries, either old or modern. I must confess that it was not found by a systematic perusal of the Greek historian, but came quite casually into my hands. But it clearly shows that a systematic investigation of classical authors on a wide scale may yield good and unsuspected results. At the last meeting of the "Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas" in Bangor, Professor D. Kurt Aland (Halle, Germany) reported on the plans for reviving the work on the "new Wettstein" after an interruption of about twenty years. Since last September these plans have assumed a more definite shape, and there is good hope that they will be carried out along the lines laid down by Professor Aland. Therefore an urgent appeal is made to all scholars who find parallels from classical authors illustrating the N.T. which are not to be found in collections like Wettstein, Lietzmanns' *Handbuch*, Kittel, Moulton-Milligan and Bauer's *Wörterbuch*, to publish their "observatiunculae", or to send them to the centre for the *Corpus Pagano-Hellenisticum* (c/o Theologisch Instituut der Rijksuniversiteit, Trans 10 [now Heidelberglaan 2, ed.,] Utrecht, Holland).

CHRISTIANITY ACCORDING TO 1 PETER *¹

The theme of this paper: "Christianity according to 1 Peter", may sound familiar to many of you. Its wording is not very original. A generation ago, in 1927, Dr. Anderson Scott published his fine book on *Christianity according to St. Paul*, and during the War Dr. Howard offered the ripe fruit of his penetrating and spiritual scholarship in his *Christianity according to St. John*. So far a companion volume under the title *Christianity according to St. Peter* has not appeared. But a very notable contribution to the understanding of this Epistle was made in this country ten years ago by the Dean of Winchester, Dr. Selwyn, in his great commentary. This modest effort is of course not worthy to be compared with these important books. At the utmost it can give a short sketch of what the writer dreams about such a book. The title being modelled after these works, and therefore not original, may sound somewhat pretentious. It is meant, however, as a grain of incense to British scholarship in the field of the New Testament which they represent so worthily—a token of thanksgiving to men from different churches, yet one in their devotion to the exposition of the Scriptures.

Perhaps this paper may draw attention to a gap, for it is a pity that such a book on 1 Peter has not been written. Even Professor Cullmann's great book *Peter, Disciple, Apostle and Martyr* deals more with the man Peter than with the Epistle. Luther, who had such a fine sense of religious values, ranked this letter together with the writings of St. Paul and St. John, and called it one of the noblest books of the New Testament, "a powerful, rich epistle though it is short". It is true that there are a number of traps waiting here, especially the question whether the Apostle Peter was its author or not, on which scholars are still divided. But apart from this the letter itself is a great witness to Christ and has always appealed to Christian hearts and minds. It would be worth while to show its particular lines within the common Christian pattern.

For a fair appreciation of the character of Christianity according

* Appeared in *The Expository Times*, LXVIII, Dec. 1956, p. 79-83.

¹ A lecture delivered for the Institute of Christian Education under the auspices of 'The Montgomery Lectureship Trust' in Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham, Bristol, and London, in January and February 1956.

to this Epistle it is necessary to have the historical situation clearly in mind. In general a letter is so closely connected with a specific situation that it is largely determined thereby. But is 1 Peter really a letter? In its outward appearance it is. Its inscription closely resembles that of the Pauline epistles and has adopted the usual formulas of antiquity with a certain Christian stamp: "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia . . . Grace to you and peace be multiplied" (i 1-2). It ends with salutations and the ordinary: "Peace be unto you all that are in Christ" (v 14). If this is accepted, one generally holds that the writer had in view the Christian Church of his time as a whole, taking the "dispersion" as a designation of the Christians who live scattered throughout the world as in a foreign country, while having their homeland in heaven. Because 1 Peter has been incorporated in the canon among the "Catholic epistles", this may seem plausible, but the explicit enumeration of certain parts of Asia Minor speaks against such a spiritualization as does the reference to the brotherhood in the rest of the world (v 9); it is not a general letter, but sent to particular churches. However, there is a growing tendency among scholars to deny this epistolary character and to consider this writing as a baptismal sermon. According to this view, set forth with great clarity in the German commentary of Windisch-Preisker and defended in this country by the late Canon Streeter, the form of the letter must be stripped off as a later addition; the body of the Epistle is a combination of two pieces, the break being at iv 12; in the former part persecutions are spoken of as possible, in the latter section they are a given reality. In the former part we have a sermon at a baptismal ceremony showing the new life which the Christian has received; in the latter we have a more general admonition to steadfastness in time of persecution. Quite recently the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford, Dr. F. L. Cross, has reinforced this theory by new arguments, drawn chiefly from his intimate knowledge of patristic literature and liturgy, in his little book *1 Peter, a Paschal Liturgy*. Though Dr. Cross gallantly invites his readers to tear his work to pieces, it is not my intention to do so now. Sufficient be it for the moment to say that his arguments have not convinced me. The use of the Greek verb $\piάσχω$ = *to suffer* is so closely linked up with current facts that it never suggests a wordplay with $\piάσχα$ = Easter. The expression, men-

tioning baptism in iii 21, cannot be pressed, the word "now" being here used as a counterpart to the Flood of old. Many expressions which Dr. Cross connects with baptism have a far more general meaning; and when he speaks of the slaves, women, and men, as the three classes of people present at that particular baptism he overlooks the formal structure of the whole submission passage, in which these classes are mentioned, the scheme being not particularly baptismal.

There is in my opinion no reason to divide the writing into two parts because the way in which sufferings are spoken of in iv 12 ff. is not different from that in the beginning. The author there starts with a new topic, namely that sufferings are not an abnormal experience for Christians, a topic which formed also part of the instruction. As far as I can see no cogent arguments for denying the epistolary character of this letter have been advanced. Its adherents are compelled to critical operations which are not based on the text, and ought to give reasons why a sermon was turned into a letter at a later stage and why these particular names at the beginning are mentioned; but that has never been done.

After a careful survey of various solutions which have been proposed, Moffatt, in his well-known *Introduction* declared, "Any theory of the writing thus turns out to involve a fairly speculative reconstruction of the historical data requisite for its setting". It is true that our historical knowledge is not so extensive as we could wish, or sufficient to enable us to define the situation exactly. But the Epistle gives sufficient data to make it fairly clear. The great difficulty is that one has often looked in a wrong direction, trying to link up the sufferings which are so often referred to with a persecution by State authorities. But this connexion turned out to be impossible. Such a view cannot be reconciled with the way in which the Christians are called to submission under those authorities, and the well-known persecutions of Nero, Domitian, and Trajan were not world-wide, as is supposed in 1 Peter. If we look into the matter it is clear that the author does not speak of regular persecutions, but of *sufferings* which come from ill-tempered neighbours. Christians are slandered by their neighbours because they do not share in the same way of living: "wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them into the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you" (iv 4). They are reproached for the name of Christ and looked upon as evil-doers, because they keep aloof from paganism and have

meetings of their own. If we see what Acts tells us about St. Paul's experiences in several places, if we see what even in the present time happens when Christians form a small minority which follows a different way of life, we find a sufficient explanation for these sentences. There is no indication whatever that the authorities were involved in it. But are we not completely at a loss in rejecting this persecution theory? I do not think so. The Epistle itself offers a sufficient number of indications.

Can we get a clear picture of the situation in which the first readers lived and in which the author sees them? For a proper understanding of the letter's message it is highly important, and more helpful than the identification of the author himself. For even if, as I believe, St. Peter was the inspiring mind behind this Epistle, this fact would not help us very much to a better insight, because we do not know Peter's ideas sufficiently well. Besides that, a letter which conveys a message to a certain, well-defined group of people is most strongly concerned with the present condition of the future readers as it actually is, or as the writer thinks it is.

Though we have rejected the idea that this letter is a baptismal sermon, it will be wise to see that there is a kernel of truth in it. The readers have passed over from one stage to another. These former pagans who lived according to the desire of the Gentiles have become Christians: "for ye were going astray like sheep; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and overseer of your souls" (ii 25); they were in time past, the writer says, with a reference to the prophecy of Hosea, no people, but now they are the people of God (ii 10). The nation to which they belong through the deliverance by the blood of Christ (i 18, 19) is characterized with epithets, applied in the Old Testament to Israel: "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession". This is a quotation from Ex. xix 6; that group of Israelites which had been delivered out of Egypt and with which the Lord was going to make His covenant was so called. This designation expresses the status of the Lord's chosen people.

In this connexion it is important to pay attention to the wording of the address. In addition to the words quoted before it is said: "elect sojourners, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (i 2). The sequence of this trinitarian formula is striking and unique in early Christian literature: because the

Spirit is mentioned first and Jesus Christ at the end; one would have expected the reverse order. But if we take the "sprinkling of the blood" as a reference to Ex. xxiv and are led by this clue, it is obvious that it all follows the way in which the Lord made Israel His own people at Mount Sinai: this was election by God's preference (a better translation than "foreknowledge"); the people had to sanctify themselves (Ex. xix) and were prompted to obedience and sprinkled with the blood of the covenant (Ex. xxiv). Peter says that what happened to the chosen people of old has also been done unto his readers, but within the Christian dispensation.

This idea is not so peculiar. It was said by the rabbis that the proselytes entered into Israel in the same way in which the ancient Israel had been admitted into the covenant. Now it is very interesting to see that in a number of places this Epistle uses expressions which are closely parallel to those used in connexion with the proselytes among the Jews. One of the most striking is that in which the writer speaks about the work of Christ "who suffered to bring us to God"; this expression may seem somewhat pale to us, but when we notice that "to bring" (προσάγω) is a translation of the Hebrew word הִקְרִיב it appears to be a technical term for "to make proselytes", members of the chosen people, those who are not so by birth. In rabbinic terminology they were also styled "new born children" (cf. ii 2). Philo of Alexandria says that they have come out of the darkness of paganism to the radiant light (cf. ii 9). Further examples may be passed by for the moment.

This incorporation into God's people has been brought about by the work of Christ. They have been redeemed from the slavery of sin and the doom under which the pagans lay, not with corruptible offerings or with money, but with the precious blood of the Lamb Christ. Here we find a parallel with the proselyte offering which was the final act of initiation, without which it was not effective. Now in contrast with the former doom they are sure of the coming salvation (i 5). The Apostle assures his readers that they really belong to the chosen people. It may be that he is thinking here of the so-called "God-fearers", men like Cornelius and others who are often mentioned in Acts. They formed a group of people on the fringe of the synagogues; pagan men and women who had become interested in Judaism, especially in its monotheism. According to rabbinical teaching they could not be counted as members of the chosen people unless they became full proselytes and accepted the

Jewish Law with all its requirements. Among these people the Christian mission made a good many converts, as we are told in Acts. The sacrifice of Christ had given them the full entrance to God, because He had brought atonement.

They may live in full confidence, because "he that believeth on him [Christ, the corner stone], shall not be put to shame". Peter, however, does not preach to prospective converts, but to Christians who had passed from pagan life to the full communion with God. The work of Christ "whom not having seen ye love; on whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice greatly", is the basis of their new existence; it has been preached as a word of good tidings which abideth for ever. It was not make-belief, but reality.

But notwithstanding all that, they are now in trouble. Because they did not fashion themselves according to their former lusts in the time of their ignorance (cf. i 14), they are reviled, considered as joy-killers and evil-doers; instead of receiving the glory of God they have to suffer in various ways. This puts their faith on trial. "Ye have been put to grief in manifold temptations". It is hard to battle against the stream, especially in an environment where the "manner of life handed down from the fathers", from which they have been redeemed, was holy, like *adat* in the East. Our missionary practice can give numerous illustrations of this hardship, or even the situation of our Protestant brethren in Spain, or even closer to us the difficulties of a young Christian who has to live in a fully secularized group. Then the foundation must be solid and the ultimate vision of God clear and the eyes must be eyes of faith, lest the faith be lost, bartered for a quiet life in conformity with the community.

Though they are sojourners of the Dispersion they surely belong to the people of God; though their faith is put on trial they must endure because they belong to that holy nation which expects the great inheritance. In this way the situation is quite clear and we understand the closing words of the Epistle: "I have written unto you briefly, exhorting, and testifying that this is the true grace of God, in which ye must take a firm stand" (v 12). It is an exhortation based upon the witness about Christ which shows itself also in the shaping of the various passages of this letter. It is not a possible danger, which a preacher mentions just as a possibility, but the whole situation itself is beset with dangers.

And yet the disciples of Christ live therein. What should be their way of life? In putting this question we use one of the keynotes of

this Epistle. Christianity according to I Peter is not a certain set of ideas, but ἀναστροφή = *a way of life*, a new life as "children of obedience", "that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness" (ii 24). This faith which brought them out of ignorance to the knowledge of the true God has a definite impact on their behaviour. This change from darkness into light means a change of life.

The Epistle constantly shows this double character: 1. this new faith implies a new attitude; 2. the new life finds its strength in this new relation with God. It is a constant dialectical process between dogmatics and ethics. This forms, I think, its beauty and attractiveness. The creed is not mere theory or a number of abstract theses about the supernatural, but is of existential importance. Ethics are not prescribed according to men's nature or choice, but with a constant orientation on the heart of the Christian message. This letter is not a call to repentance to outsiders or a theoretical discussion of certain points in Christianity—one misses, for example, a word about the Old Testament law—but deals with the concrete situation in which not heresies were threatening, but the Christian life in its totality was in danger. This double way of coping with the questions may be illustrated with these verses: "And if ye call on him as Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to each man's work, pass the time of your sojourning in fear" (i 17); "love one another from the heart fervently: having been begotten again" (i 22b-23).

This new life, regenerated by the abiding word of God, is still to be lived in this unchanged world, where the "adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour", where men live according to their own lusts and not according to the will of God, where Christian slaves suffer the hardships of their social condition and Christian wives are married to those who are disobedient to the Word. It is a life full of anxieties, reviling, and sufferings for the name of Christ. Their faith is tested as by fire. In spite of all these difficulties, however, the author's outlook is not a gloomy one. There is a note of joy ringing from one end to the other. This time of suffering is a limited one, "though now for a little while, if need be, ye have been put to grief" (i 6). God has called them unto His eternal glory in Christ "after that ye have suffered a little while" (v 10). Then will come the fulfilment of their hope which God has given them. The resurrection of Christ from

the dead is an example for the Christians to die unto sin and to come to the new life; an example also of glory after suffering. But it is not only that: it is also the firm ground; it opened the way "unto an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time". The life on earth is compared with that of a colony; the Christians as citizens of the city of God live here as strangers and sojourners.

Here we find a totally different attitude from that of the leading moral philosophy of the time, Stoicism. There the wise man knows amidst the sufferings of the world that there is an ultimate escape, the open harbour, death. Life rests ultimately in his own hands. Here it is committed to the faithful Creator (iv 19). In Stoicism we miss the tone of expectation and joy, because man is left alone. There he is generated as a citizen of this world by nature; in 1 Peter he is regenerated to citizenship of a new world by the Word of God.

Christian life stands in the tension of eschatological expectation "between the times". "The end of all things is at hand." That is the time of God's visitation, of His judgment (ii 12). Therefore the Christians must be sober and watchful (v 8), do away with everything that is against the will of God, and live a seemly life. It is well summed up in iii 8 "be ye all likeminded, compassionate, loving as brethren, tenderhearted, humble-minded; not rendering evil for evil, or reviling for reviling; but contrariwise blessing". They are called to put away all wickedness and guile, and must offer spiritual sacrifices to God, their prayers and lives—love the brethren and do well to all men.

This will of God is revealed in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. The rule of holiness is set by the Law; the work of Christ is described with reference to the sacrifices of the Law and with the words of the prophet Isaiah. Sarah is an example for Christian women and words from Psalms and Proverbs are applied to Christian behaviour. But what the prophets foretold about the salvation has come because at *the end of the times* Christ was manifested for the sake of the believers. He is the great example of a life fully committed to God, going through suffering into glory. Many words of this Epistle remind us of what the Lord Jesus had said, for example, ii 12, "that . . . they may by your good works . . . glorify God in the day of visitation" recalls Mt. v 16 "let your light shine before men, that

they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven"; 1 Pet. v 6 about humbleness resembles Lk. xiv 11; "every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted". In this last case it is interesting to see that no reference is made to a word of Jesus but that the Old Testament is quoted. The Lord showed in His sufferings how the Christians have to endure; "who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who, when he was reviled, reviled not again . . . but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously".

The Christian people are called to show forth the excellencies of God, who called them out of darkness into His marvellous light. This leads to a further line of thought. The new life is a life of "good actions". The Christians stand in the world and are not called to leave it. There is a boundary which the holy ones are not allowed to pass, but there is no asceticism preached here. An analysis of this term "good works" shows that it is not a selection of particular mannerisms, but a manner of life according to the highest standards of human behaviour. As such it can be recognized by non-Christians. It gets its stamp from the fear of God and even implies a humble submission which is contrary to the Greek conception (where humility is always a vice) but in accordance with the Old Testament. Through these "good works" they are in line with God's commands and will be honoured by the authorities, because they will not be in conflict with the laws. Thereby they will stop the mouth of their revilers and even win them for Christ. They must have a good conscience and always be ready to give an answer to them who ask them reasons concerning their hope. Suffering may be the consequence of their faith, but that is according to the will of God and not because of any unrighteous deed. The judgment of God is coming, in which the righteous will be scarcely saved, and where will the sinner be then?

This Christianity according to 1 Peter stands in the tension between this world and the Kingdom of God, in the freedom and light Christ has brought, suffering and rejoicing, doing well towards brethren and the outside world as a reflection of the excellencies of their God. It is a Christian faith, in trials steadfast and in trouble full of living hope, because it rests in the work of the eternal God: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

So the Apostle wrote long ago and to a Christian community which lived under completely different circumstances from our own.

It may be that this message will be better understood in parts of the world where Biblical Christianity makes man an outcast. But only there? Life for us, it is true, has become far more complicated: Christian men and women are called to decisions which were unheard of in New Testament times. But it is also true what a minister of my church wrote recently: modern men and women live under the slavery of laws which do not leave them a place to be Christian. In many ways that is so. It seems to me that in these conditions the message of this letter gets a new meaning. The same principle which St. Peter laid down for his brethren and sisters in Christ, to the community of his days, still holds good. In this secularized world the Christian faith, our loyalty to Christ, who came "to bring us to God", in its simplest form is at stake. Are we delivered from vain traditions and outward appearance? Is the preaching of the coming Kingdom of God a bright reality, because we are set free by Christ? Do our silent deeds bear witness that Christ is our example? Do we rejoice in the hope and give reasons for it? Is there that brotherly love among Christians? Every passage of this practical letter puts before us a question which calls for an answer from every reader, a personal and a collective answer. And it is amazingly clear in relating the work of Christ to the changing conditions of men.

CANON

DE LA RÈGLE
Μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν
DANS L'HISTOIRE DU CANON*

Quel serait l'auteur qui a appliqué pour la première fois le nom de „Nouveau Testament” à un recueil d'écrits choisis dans la littérature chrétienne en les revêtant d'une autorité canonique? Vers quelle époque ce titre s'est-il introduit?

La tradition de l'ancienne église n'y donne pas de réponse nette. On ne cite aucun nom spécial. Nulle part il n'est fait mention d'un synode qui eût adopté le mot. Il paraît que ce fait d'une portée mondiale s'est consommé en silence. On ne saurait fixer la date. Au début du troisième siècle le terme est supposé connu.

On ¹ a supposé que cet emploi particulier du terme „Nouveau Testament” était connu dès l'époque de Méliton de Sardes (±175).² Cet apologiste du Christianisme donne une liste des livres juifs qu'il résume sous le nom d'„Ancien Testament”.³ Le fait qu'il se sert de cette expression au lieu de parler simplement des „Ecritures” comme on fit auparavant paraît indiquer qu'il a connu un Nouveau Testament correspondant et complémentaire. Mais le mot fait défaut dans les œuvres de l'évêque de l'Asie Mineure qui nous sont parvenues. Voilà pourquoi cette supposition ne saurait être qu'une hypothèse très vraisemblable.

Le second texte qui sous ce rapport demande notre attention est le témoignage d'un auteur combattant le montanisme vers la fin du second siècle. Il se sert du mot *καινή διαθήκη*, mais seulement en passant. Malheureusement il ne cite pas les livres qui font partie de ce Nouveau Testament. Il omet même de dire qu'on a désigné par là des livres. Ainsi l'exégèse de ce terme reste équivoque. Il est possible que l'auteur visât un canon — laissons de côté l'étendu — pourtant il se pourrait également qu'il employât le mot *διαθήκη* dans le même sens que S. Paul, c.-à-d. pour indiquer une certaine

* Paru dans *Vigiliae Christianae*, Volume III, 1949, p. 1-36.

¹ Entre autres A. von Harnack, *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen der neuen Schöpfung*, Leipzig 1914, p. 69.

² Cf. C. Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardes*, dans: *Studies and Documents* XII, London-Philadelphia 1940, p. 3-5.

³ Melito, ap. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* IV 26, 14 (fr. 3 dans: E. J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten*, Göttingen 1914, p. 309).

époque (2 Cor. iii, cf. Justin Martyr, *Dialogus c. Tryphone* 118, 122). Sur ce point les opinions des savants diffèrent. Voilà pourquoi il n'est pas inutile de soumettre ce témoignage à un examen minutieux. En interprétant bien certains détails auxquels on n'a pas prêté suffisamment attention jusqu'ici tout le passage jette une lumière intéressante sur l'histoire du développement du canon.

Dans son histoire du Montanisme Eusèbe ne fait pas un récit personnel de ce mouvement, mais donne des résumés détaillés d'œuvres actuellement perdues contre l'hérésie phrygienne (*Hist. Eccl.* V 16 ss.).⁴ Le texte qui appelle notre attention se trouve dans la première partie. Le nom de l'auteur n'est pas cité. Jérôme croyait que c'était un certain Rhodon; ⁵ son hypothèse se basant sur une combinaison erronée de données, on n'y ajoute plus foi et l'on a l'habitude de parler de l'„antimontaniste anonyme". Selon l'opinion générale il a écrit son livre pendant l'hiver de 192-193.⁶

L'écrit s'adresse à Avircius Marcellus sans autre indication. Généralement on l'identifie avec l'Abercius dont Ramsay découvrit l'épithaphe. Celui-ci fut-il réellement évêque de Hiérapolis et succéda-t-il à Papias, comme le prétend son biographe du 4^{me} siècle? ⁷ Dans ce cas le livre nous mène au centre de la tradition de l'Asie Mineure.

Dans l'introduction l'auteur fait remarquer qu'Avircius l'avait chargé ⁸ depuis longtemps d'écrire contre l'hérésie. Jusque là il n'était pas arrivé à s'y mettre. Ce n'était pas que les arguments qui devaient réfuter le mensonge et témoigner de la vérité lui manquaient. Loin de là! Il craignait d'écrire un livre. La cause de cette peur est curieuse à connaître. Ce ne fut ni l'incompétence réelle ni une prétendue modestie qui devait servir si souvent de „captatio benevolentiae". Il s'exprime en ces termes: δεδιώς δὲ καὶ ἐξευλαβού-

⁴ Collection de textes sur le Montanisme par P. de Labriolle, *Les sources de l'histoire du montanisme*, Paris 1913 et N. Bonwetsch, *Texte zur Geschichte des Montanismus*, *Kleine Texte* 129, Bonn 1914.

⁵ Hieronymus, *De viris inlustribus* 37, 39.

⁶ O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*², Freiburg i. Br., 1913, vol. I, p. 431-432; A. Puech, *Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne*, Paris 1928, tom. II, p. 261-262.

⁷ Bardenhewer, p. 493 nie qu'Abercius eût rempli une fonction ecclésiastique, quoiqu'il accepte l'identité. H. Strathmann dit: „in A., dem Bischof von Hierapolis, wäre dann ein bedeutsamer Kirchenführer des 2. Jh. fassbar", voir: H. Strathmann-Th. Klauser, *Aberkios*, dans: *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Lief. 1, col. 12-17.

⁸ ἐπιταχθεὶς ὑπὸ σοῦ· est-ce que cela suggère l'idée d'un évêque imposant une tâche à un inférieur?

μενος μή πη δόξω τισὶν ἐπισυγγράφειν ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεσθαι τῷ τῆς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καινῆς διαθήκης λόγῳ, ὃ μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτ' ἀφελεῖν δυνατὸν τῷ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτὸ πολιτεύεσθαι προηρημένῳ (*Hist. Eccl.* V 16, 3). Dans les paragraphes suivants il expose alors de quelle façon cette peur a été surmontée: dans l'église d'Ancyre, sous l'impression de la nouvelle prophétie, il avait élevé la voix contre elle plusieurs jours de suite; les presbytres de cette ville l'ayant prié de mettre par écrit ces sermons il ne s'en était pas acquitté sur le champ, mais dans ce livre-ci il a voulu réaliser sa promesse.

Les paroles citées composent le sujet de cet article. Est-ce qu'on parle du Nouveau Testament comme d'un recueil? Feine, Behm et Michaelis répondent par l'affirmative;⁹ Leipoldt paraît partager leur avis¹⁰. Grosheide au contraire dans son *Canonique Générale du N.T.* soutient qu'il ne s'agit pas là d'un recueil.¹¹ Des deux côtés cependant les arguments font défaut. Il en est tout autre chez les deux grands historiens de l'Eglise qui ont approfondi l'étude du canon du Nouveau Testament: Zahn et Harnack.

Ce qui frappe dans le raisonnement de Zahn, c'est une certaine hésitation. Dans son *Geschichte des neut. Kanons* (1888)¹² il écrit dans une discussion détaillée au sujet de ce passage: „Es kann keine Frage unterliegen, dass hier das ganze ntl. Schrifttum als ein abgegrenzter heiliger Bezirk erscheint, dessen Grenzen zu erweitern als ein Frevel gilt". Cependant il ne faut pas croire qu'il s'agit ici d'un Nouveau Testament complet, comme nous l'entendons aujourd'hui, car il résulte d'une quantité de données simultanées à quel point tout était encore incertain.¹³ La signification réelle paraît en l'opposant aux Montanistes puisque ceux-ci affirmaient que la période des révélations avait recommencé; l'Eglise toutefois était d'avis: „dass die Periode der für die ganze Christenheit massgebenden Offenbarung und daher auch die Zeit der Erzeugung hl. Schriften mit dem End der apostolischen Zeit abgeschlossen

⁹ P. Feine, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*⁸, Leipzig 1930, p. 235⁸, bearbeitet von J. Behm, Leipzig 1936, p. 280; W. Michaelis, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Bern 1946, p. 344.

¹⁰ J. Leipoldt, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, I *Die Entstehung*, Leipzig 1907, p. 128, nt. 4-p. 129.

¹¹ F. W. Grosheide, *Algemeene Canoniek van het Nieuwe Testament*, Amsterdam 1935, p. 197, nt. 5.

¹² Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, Erlangen 1888, vol. I, p. 112-116.

¹³ Th. Zahn, p. 98 ff.

sei'' et plus loin: „Die Vorstellung der Abgeschlossenheit bezog sich also nicht unmittelbar auf den Kreis der Schriften, sondern auf die Zeit, welcher sie entstammten''; cela excitait à recueillir des écrits sans que cela constituât un canon. Cette hésitation apparaît très nette aussi dans sa synthèse postérieure: „Sie findet sich noch nicht bei Irenaeus, auch noch nicht deutlich bei dem Antimontanisten''.¹⁴ Cette hésitation frappe d'autant plus que c'est précisément à Zahn qu'on a reproché de considérer le canon comme clos à une époque où il ne l'était pas encore.

Chez Von Harnack on trouve une divergence d'opinions dans ses écrits successifs. Là où il combat la construction de Zahn, il fait remarquer à propos de cet endroit: „Ein Anderer wird hier mit mehr Recht gerade das Umgekehrte herauslesen: dieser Schriftsteller schrieb zu einer Zeit, in der man es noch nicht für unmöglich hielt, das Jemand dem λόγος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου etwas hinzuzufügen wage. Der Schriftsteller schrieb um das Jahr 200! Dreissig Jahre später hätte er sich mit seiner Furcht einfach lächerlich gemacht''.¹⁵ Faudrait-il en conclure que selon Harnack on n'a pas eu en vue un recueil définitif? Il n'est pas très clair ce qu'il veut dire ici exactement, mais je crois que dans sa polémique il a fait tort à Zahn. Lorsque dans sa *Dogmengeschichte* ¹⁶ Von Harnack parle du Nouveau Testament, il cite Méliton et Tertullien, mais non l'antimontaniste anonyme, d'où l'on pourrait conclure qu'il n'attache aucune importance à ce passage. Cinq ans plus tard cependant dans son livre sur l'origine du N.T. il est assez catégorique. L'expression de l'antimontaniste il l'estime „deshalb so wichtig, weil es erstlich noch zeigt, dass das Evangelium der regierende Faktor ist und zweitens nur bei der Annahme verständlich ist, dass dem Autor der λόγος τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης als in den Schriften niedergelegt vor Augen schwebt und dass zu diesen Schriften nicht nur Evangelien gehörten''; sinon sa crainte ne saurait s'expliquer. Probablement l'Apocalypse en faisait partie, car dans la fin du passage perce une certaine dépendance de l'Apoc. xxii 18-19.¹⁷

¹⁴ Th. Zahn, *Kanon des NTs.*, dans: J. J. Herzog-A. Hauck, *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*³, Leipzig 1901, vol. IX, p. 771.

¹⁵ A. Harnack, *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200*, Freiburg i. Br. 1889, p. 43.

¹⁶ A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*⁴, Tübingen 1909, p. 378-379.

¹⁷ A. von Harnack, *Entstehung des N.T.*, 1914, p. 69, nt. 1.

Il y a donc divergence d'opinions, hésitation et incertitude. Serait-il possible de résoudre le problème?

Evidemment on peut partir du mot Διαθήκη. On le rencontre encore une fois dans les extraits d'Eusèbe, à savoir dans un livre de Miltiades contre les Montanistes. Tout cela provient donc du même climat et du même milieu. Eusèbe lui-même dit:¹⁸ ὑποκαταβάς δὲ ἐν ταύτῳ τοὺς κατὰ τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην προπεφητευκότας καταλέγει parmi qui il compte aussi un certain Ananias de Philadelphie et Quadratus.¹⁹ A l'encontre de l'ignorance et de la frénésie de l'âme que montra Montanus Miltiades fait observer: τοῦτον δὲ τὸν τρόπον οὔτε τινὰ τῶν κατὰ τὴν παλαιάν, οὔτε τῶν κατὰ τὴν καινὴν πνευματοφορηθέντα προφήτην δεῖξαι δυνήσονται (V 17, 3). Toute la question est de savoir comment il faut interpréter κατὰ. Le mot peut signifier „durant”²⁰ et se rapporter par conséquent à une période; dans ce cas on sera obligé de croire que cette période est terminée et ne vise pas toute l'époque après Jésus-Christ. On peut l'interpréter également comme un synonyme de „suivant”, alors le passage paraît prouver l'existence d'un recueil définitif (c'est ainsi qu'Eusèbe l'a interprété en se basant sur l'emploi de διαθήκη au 4^{me} siècle), mais dans ce cas on s'étonnerait à bon droit de ce qu'on cite ces noms qui ne sont pas du Nouveau Testament. De cette manière non plus on ne saurait aboutir à une décision.

En examinant V 16, 3 d'un point de vue du style, ce qui attire l'attention c'est que cette phrase se compose de deux parties c.-à-d. δεδιώς — λόγῳ et ᾧ — προηρημένῳ. L'antimontaniste parle des suites éventuelles de son action, qui consiste dans le ἐπισυγγράφειν ἢ ἐπιδιатάσσεσθαι: donc il s'agirait là d'*ajouter* à des écrits existant déjà (comme le fait à bon droit Harnack, 1914). *Il ne saurait être question du mot „enlever”*. Cependant il continue avec cette deuxième partie ᾧ μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτ' ἀφελεῖν δυνατὸν κτλ. Ceci ne s'ensuit pas logiquement de ce qui précède.

Jusqu'ici l'on ne s'est jamais suffisamment rendu compte de ce que doit être une règle générale que chacun, désirant vivre selon l'Evangile (en contraste avec les juifs, cf. Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tr.* 45, 3: τοὺς κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν Μωυσέως πολιτευσαμένους et les hérétiques) doit observer; ²¹ il est clair que les autres n'avaient pas besoin d'en

¹⁸ Eusebius, *H.E.* V 17,2.

¹⁹ Bardenhewer, p. 183-187.

²⁰ W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*³, Berlin 1937, col. 675-677.

²¹ δυνατὸν + dat. pers., cf. Bauer, col. 345,2b.

tenir compte: ils pouvaient tranquillement ἐπισυγγράφειν. Μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτ' ἀφελεῖν n'a pas été formulé *ad hoc*, mais se trouve être dans son rapport une règle générale, appliquée par l'auteur à son projet, ce qui dans ce cas concret fait naître la crainte d'une transgression.

Sans qu'il ait signalé tous les endroits, Zahn a déjà appelé notre attention sur le fait que cette expression se rencontre aussi dans d'autres auteurs de cette époque.²² Pour la discussion suivante il est nécessaire de les examiner dans leur contexte.²³

a) Irénée *Adv. Haer.* IV 33, 8. Ce passage si important sur la tradition présente des difficultés spéciales à l'exégèse et à la traduction, le texte grec étant perdu tandis que la traduction latine a été transmise avec beaucoup de variantes.²⁴ La leçon originale me paraît: (γνώσις ἀληθείας) *quae parvenit usque ad nos custodita sine fictione, scripturarum tractatio plenissima, neque additamentum neque ablationem recipiens* (ces derniers mots n'ont pas de variante); *et lectio sine falsatione et secundum scripturas expositio legitima*. Ici encore on trouve la règle, employée en rapport avec les Ecritures,²⁵ comme explication plus détaillée du mot „plenissima”. La suite montrera la justesse de cette interprétation. Ainsi les diverses parties logiquement liées entr'elles constituaient une phrase claire;²⁶ d'abord il est question du recueil même des Ecritures saintes, qui est intact; ensuite de la lecture sans fautes; ensuite de l'exégèse plus détaillée.

b) Irénée *Adv. Haer.* V 30, 1 parle du nombre 666 (Apoc. xiii 18) en racontant que certains lisaient 616.²⁷ Irénée ne le comprend pas, les meilleurs manuscrits ayant 666. Ceux qui sans méchanceté soustraient cinquante seront pardonnés de Dieu, mais ceux qui par vanité en déduisaient le nom de l'antichrist, en seront punis καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ζημίᾳ ἐν τῷ ἀποτυχεῖν τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ τὸ μὴ ὂν ὡς ὃν ὑπολαβεῖν· ἔπειτα δὲ τοῦ προσθέντος ἢ ἀφελόντος τι τῆς

²² Dans: *P.R.E.*³, IX, p. 773-774.

²³ Pour faciliter la comparaison les textes sont cités *in extenso*.

²⁴ Nous n'entrons pas ici dans une discussion sur ce texte difficile, mais avons suivi la leçon adoptée par E. Klebba dans sa traduction, *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, Kempten 1912, vol. II, p. 109 et N. Bonwetsch, *Die Theologie des Irenäus*, Gütersloh 1925, p. 48-49.

²⁵ Les difficultés du texte de Harvey se font claires dans la traduction de A. Roberts-W. H. Rambaut dans: *The Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Edinburgh 1911, vol. II, p. 11.

²⁶ Bonwetsch, *Theologie des Irenäus*, p. 41.

²⁷ Cf. E. Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece*¹⁷, Stuttgart 1941, p. 638.

γραφῆς ἐπιτιμίαν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν ἔχοντος, εἰς αὐτὴν ἐμπεσεῖν ἀνάγκη τὸν τοιοῦτον.

Ce passage apprend nettement deux faits importants:

a) L'action d'ajouter et celle d'ôter se rapportent à l'Écriture (cela confirme l'interprétation donnée sub (a)).

b) Irénée connaît donc une règle générale exprimée par le génitif absolu, à savoir qu'il est défendu d'omettre ou d'ajouter quoi que ce soit et qu'une transgression est sévèrement punie. Il applique cette règle dans ce cas concret.

c) Tertullien, *De praescriptione haereticorum*, ch. 38 (198-200)²⁸ reproche aux hérétiques comme Valentin et Marcion, qu'ils ont faussé l'Écriture sainte: *Sicut illis non potuisset succedere corruptela doctrinae sine corruptela instrumentorum eius, ita et nobis integritas doctrinae non competisset sine integritate eorum, per quae doctrina tractatur*. Il définit cette *integritas* par ces mots: *quid de proprio intulimus, ut aliquid contrarium ei ... in scripturis deprehensum detractatione, vel adiectione vel transmutatione remediaremus?* Marcion éliminait ce qui ne lui convenait pas; Valentin renchérit encore; il épargnait le texte, *sed materiam ad scripturas excogitavit; et tamen plus abstulit et plus adiecit, auferens proprietates singulorum quoque verborum et adiciens dispositiones non comparentium rerum*.

Ici encore on constate que Tertullien pense à une règle générale-ment connue concernant l'Écriture Sainte qu'il applique dans ce cas. Puisqu'il ne saurait accuser Valentin d'avoir réellement changé les paroles de l'Écriture, au fond il n'y eut guère lieu de parler de *auferre* et *adicere*. Pourtant il applique cette expression en étant sûr de l'adhésion de ses lecteurs.

d) Tertullien, *Adversus Hermogenem* ch. 22 (200-201)²⁹ combat par le récit de la Genèse la conception d'Hermogène, selon qui le monde serait d'une matière éternelle non-crée. Tertullien dit qu'il est toujours clairement indiqué de quoi un objet est composé et argumente *e silentio*: *An autem de aliqua subiacenti materia facta sint omnia nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat Vae illud adicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum*.

Donc ici encore une règle générale, appliquée au cas spécial d'une falsification de l'Écriture. Il faut faire attention à ce que ces deux

²⁸ Bardenhewer, II, p. 405.

²⁹ Bardenhewer, II, p. 441.

témoignages de Tertullien datent de sa période catholique, c.-à-d. avant sa conversion au Montanisme.

e) Dans les débats sur la date de Pâques,³⁰ Polycrate, *Epistula ad Victorem* (ap. Eusèbe *H.E.* V 24)³¹ défendait le point de vue de l'Asie Mineure, qui suivant Eusèbe: Τὸ πάλαι πρότερον αὐτοῖς παραδοθὲν διαφυλάττειν ἔθος χρῆναι (§ 1). La pensée de Polycarpe lui-même fut conçue en ces termes: ἡμεῖς οὖν ἀρχιδιούργητον ἄγομεν. Τὴν ἡμέραν μήτε προστιθέντες μήτε ἀφαιρούμενοι (§ 2). Il s'autorisait des hommes illustres (μεγάλα στοιχεῖα) dans l'histoire ecclésiastique de l'Asie Mineure, à partir de St. Jean et de Philippe, qui tous: ἐτήρησαν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης τοῦ πάσχα κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μηδὲν παρεκβαίνοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ἀκολουθοῦντες (§ 6).

Ainsi la tradition évangélique occupe donc le premier plan (appel à Jean 18, 28). L'expression μήτε προστιθέντες κτλ s'adapte mal à ἡμέρα. Elle doit expliquer le mot ἀρχιδιούργητον et en faire ressortir le caractère non falsifié. Ainsi l'expression paraît confirmer sans réserve ce qui précède, ἀρχιδιούργητον n'étant pas jugé suffisant. Elle ne se rapporte pas directement à l'Écriture bien que la tradition s'y rattache. L'accent porte sur le fait qu'elle fut regardée intacte.

f) Dionyse de Corinthe, *Ad Romanos* (± 170; ap. Eus. *H.E.* IV 23, 12)³² se plaint du fait qu'on a falsifié les lettres (ῥαδιουργηθεισῶν selon Eusèbe) qu'il a écrites sur les instances de frères non précisés, en ces termes: Καὶ ταύτας οἱ τοῦ διαβόλου ἀπόστολοι ζιζανίων γεγέμικαν ἃ μὲν ἐξαίρουσιντες, ἃ δὲ προστιθέντες, οἷς τὸ οὐαὶ κεῖται. οὐ θαυμαστὸν ἄρα εἰ καὶ τῶν κυριακῶν ῥαδιουργῆσαι τινες ἐπιβέβληνται γραφῶν, ὅποτε καὶ ταῖς οὐ τοιαύταις ἐπιβεβουλευκάσι.

Il résulte des autres fragments de Dionyse quelle importance il attachait à la tradition intacte. Evidemment „la mauvaise herbe” rappelle Mt xiii 25-40: les autres ecclésiastiques s'en servent souvent pour indiquer l'hérésie. La suite ἃ μὲν κτλ ne se marie pas bien avec cette image, mais s'applique aux lettres. On pourrait se demander si ce οὐαὶ leur est réservé parce qu'ils sont les apôtres du diable ou bien s'il y a un rapport étroit avec l'action d'„omettre ou d'ajouter”. Le texte parallèle de Tertullien (d) est en faveur de la seconde possibilité.

³⁰ H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, Berlin 1936, Vol. II, p. 129 132.

³¹ De date incertaine; Victor 189-198.

³² Bardenheuer, I, p. 429-431.

Tous ces textes datent de la même époque ($\pm$ 170-200), en partie du même milieu (l'Asie Mineure avec laquelle Tertullien paraît avoir été en relation). Tous ont ceci en commun qu'ils indiquent l'intégrité de l'Écriture et de tout ce qui se fonde sur elle par les mots „omettre et ajouter” et qu'ils repoussent les attaques des hérétiques. Dans ces années mouvementées de la fin du 2^{me} siècle, lorsque l'Eglise devait livrer une dure bataille pour défendre son droit d'existence, cela se comprend très bien. Il est curieux que Clément d'Alexandrie n'emploie pas la règle.³³ Nous ne nous occuperons pas de l'emploi postérieur de cette règle dans l'église, la formule étant alors standardisée.³⁴

L'emploi chez ces auteurs contemporains confirme ainsi ce que nous avons rencontré chez l'antimontaniste. La *καινή διαθήκη* est donc une tradition qu'on doit garder intacte. Malheur à ceux qui ont enfreint cette loi. En outre tout indique qu'il existait dès lors un recueil de livres. *Quelles sont l'origine et la signification de cette règle?*

C'est en vain qu'on cherche la règle dans les écrits des *Apologues*. On la trouve chez les *Pères apostoliques* dans *Didaché* IV 13: οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς ἐντολὰς κυρίου, φυλάξεις δὲ ἀπαρέλαβες, μήτε προστιθεὶς μήτε ἀφαιρῶν.

Cependant le rapport est différent dans le parallèle de *Barnabé*. Le commencement se trouve 19:2; plus loin on lit: „on doit donner sans murmurer, sachant qui est le bon rémunérateur, φυλάξεις ἀπαρέλαβες, μήτε προστιθεὶς μήτε ἀφαιρῶν on haïra le mal jusqu'à la fin”.

Dans les *Canons ecclésiastiques des saints Apôtres*³⁵ on a inséré comme une parole de Barthélemy, ch. 14 φυλάξεις ἀπαρέλαβες μήτε προσθεὶς μήτε ἀφαιρῶν et ch. 30 à la fin: nous demandons φυλάξαι τὰς ἐντολὰς μὴδὲν ἀφαιροῦντας ἢ προστιθέντας.

Dans cet essai il est impossible et inutile de traiter à fond les

³³ L'antithèse se rencontre une seule fois dans ses écrits, Paed. II 7,60,3 (ed. Stähelin I 193) en rapport avec l'éternité!!

³⁴ Athanasius, *Epist. Fest.* 39, 10, dans: E. Preuschen, *Analecta*, II. Teil *Zur Kanongeschichte*, Tübingen 1910, p. 44, 49. — Un choix de textes postérieurs dans W. C. van Unnik, *Nestorian Questions on the Eucharist*, Haarlem 1937, p. 197.

³⁵ B. Altaner, *Patrologie*, Freiburg i. Br. 1938, p. 26-27: „wahrscheinlich zu Beginn des 4. Jh. in Ägypten entstanden ... zeigt fortgeschrittenere Zustände, als sie in der Didache vorausgesetzt werden”. — A. Puech, *l.c.*, tom. III, p. 586-587.

rapports très compliqués entre Barnabé et Didaché.³⁶ Est-ce que tous les deux remontent à un catéchisme pour prosélytes comme l'écrit Knopf: „Die Warnung passt vorzüglich in eine Proselytenunterweisung”?³⁷

En tout cas on voit que — contraire aux endroits discutés plus haut — il n'est question ici ni d'hérésie ni de la nécessité de garder intacte l'Écriture sainte. Il est vrai qu'on parle de tradition, mais celle-ci se rapporte aux commandements où s'applique précisément la règle. On ³⁸ réfère ici à bon droit à Deutéronome iv 2 et xii 32 (voir p. 134), mais ces endroits ne suffisent pas pour expliquer la règle telle qu'elle a été appliquée par Polycrate, Irénée etc., celle-ci ayant une tendance beaucoup plus large.

Plusieurs savants ³⁹ ont cru trouver l'explication du verdict de l'antimontaniste dans la dépendance de l'Apocalypse xxii 18-19: μαρτυρῶ ἐγὼ παντὶ τῷ ἀκούοντι τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· ἐάν τις ἐπιθῇ ἐπ' αὐτά, ἐπιθήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς πληγὰς τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ· καὶ ἐάν τις ἀφέλῃ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου τῆς προφητείας ταύτης, ἀφελεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς καὶ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἁγίας, τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ.⁴⁰

En effet on trouve ici une combinaison analogue (ἐπιτίθημι-ἀφαιρέω) à celle qu'on trouve dans les textes cités tandis qu'il s'ajoute une malédiction terrible qui emprunte sa signification aux visions précédentes.

Cependant un examen plus minutieux fait ressortir plusieurs différences:

α) Apoc. emploie ἐπιτίθημι et non προστίθημι, comme partout ailleurs. Il est difficile d'établir exactement la différence entre de pareilles prépositions et le changement de signification des verbes ainsi obtenu. Bien que les significations se ressemblent, ces verbes ne sont pas identiques.⁴¹ Dans LXX on peut observer une distinc-

³⁶ Voir les commentaires de R. Knopf, *Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel, die zwei Klemensbriefe*, et H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, dans: *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Ergänzungsband*, Tübingen 1920 et F. E. Vokes, *The Riddle of the Didache*, London 1938, p. 27-51.

³⁷ R. Knopf, ad *Didaché* 4: 13, p. 19.

³⁸ Knopf et Windisch dans leurs commentaires et Bihlmeyer dans son édition des Pères apostoliques, Tübingen 1924.

³⁹ v. Harnack, Zahn, Bonwetsch, *Texte*, p. 5.

⁴⁰ Les variantes ne sont d'aucune importance, voir: H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, London 1929, vol. II, p. 640-645.

⁴¹ Cf. Bauer, col. 503-504 et col. 1199-1200.

tion remarquable: les deux verbes traduisent quantité de mots hébreux, mais il est extrêmement rare qu'ils soient employés pour rendre les mêmes idées.⁴² En outre plus tard l'emploi de ἐπιτίθημι dans ce rapport a frappé des lecteurs grecs, comme il paraît dans la Catène qui le remplace par προστίθημι.⁴³

β) Dans l'Apocalypse le rapport est différent. Le mot οὐαί ne se prononce pas, mais l'effet se fait sentir quand même. Si en effet l'emploi de la fin du 2^{me} siècle dépendait de l'Apocalypse, alors la question se poserait de savoir comment il est possible que les paroles violentes, passionnées du Visionnaire aient inspiré cette règle modérée et froide.

γ) Cependant cette supposition est loin de résoudre tout le problème, puisque cette combinaison ne se rencontre pas seulement chez les auteurs cités plus haut mais tout aussi bien dans la littérature pré-chrétienne et païenne. Zahn était dans la bonne voie quand il se référait à Josèphe,⁴⁴ mais il ne tirait pas les conclusions. D'ailleurs il y a d'autres textes où la même formule se rencontre: plusieurs commentateurs les ont recueillis⁴⁵ sans avoir été complets pour cela. Donc la question se pose *si l'auteur de l'Apocalypse a connu la règle qui existait déjà avant lui et s'il l'a appliquée en remaniant le plan de son livre.*

Dans un essai qu'Ollson a consacré à l'épilogue de l'Apocalypse,⁴⁶ il voulait démontrer qu'on saurait expliquer xxii 18-19 par les malédictions qu'on lisait dans des inscriptions funéraires plutôt que par des endroits comme Deut. iv 2, xii 32. *Epist. Arist.* 311. Selon nous les textes cités par lui n'éclaircissent guère le problème, non seulement parce que ces inscriptions sont postérieures à l'Apocalypse (elles pourraient être des formules traditionnelles), mais surtout parce que les rapports sont peu frappants et que la juxta-

⁴² E. Hatch-H. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, Oxford 1897 ff., vol. I 535, s.v. ἐπιτίθημι, II 1221, s.v. προστίθημι.

⁴³ *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, ed. J. A. Cramer, Oxford 1844, tom. VIII, p. 496 διαμαρτύρεται τοῖς ἀκούουσι, μήτε ἀφελεῖν μήτε προσθεῖναι, et H. C. Hoskier, *The complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse*, Ann Arbor 1928, p. 256-257.

⁴⁴ Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des Kanons*, vol. I, p. 115, nt. 1.

⁴⁵ W. Bousset, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*⁶, Göttingen 1906, p. 459-460; R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St John*, Edinburgh 1920, vol. II, p. 223-224; E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Tübingen 1926, p. 179.

⁴⁶ B. Ollson, *Der Epilog der Offenbarung Johannis*, dans: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* XXXI (1932), p. 84-86.

position de ἐπιτίθεναι-ἀφαιρεῖν, qui forme la quintessence de la phrase, ne s'y trouve pas.

Lohmeyer notait dans son commentaire à propos de ce verset : „Die Formel ist in ihrem Sinn und Kern traditionell (comme preuve il cite nombre d'endroits dans des écrits juifs). Sie soll aber nicht wie bei manchen Schriftstellern das Werk vor unzulässiger Erweiterung und Verkürzung schützen, sondern erhebt für dieses Buch den Anspruch auf Heiligkeit und Vollständigkeit, deshalb musz er unverseht bleiben". Il est nécessaire pour une bonne interprétation de commencer par examiner ces parallèles.⁴⁷

a) Deut. iv 1-2. *Maintenant Israel écoute les lois et les ordonnances que je vous enseigne. Mettez-les en pratique, afin que vous viviez et que vous entriez en possession du pays que vous donne l'Eternel, le Dieu de vos pères.* (2) οὐ προσθήσεσθε πρὸς τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἀφελεῖτε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ· φυλάσσεσθε τὰς ἐντολὰς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν, après quoi on insiste dans toutes sortes de variations sur la nécessité de garder les commandements de Jahwe. Le texte hébreu et le Targum n'offrent pas de variations; on cite le texte grec parce que dans notre examen il s'agit précisément d'une association de mots grecs (Hebr. יהא et רצו: Aram. יהי et מנע). Deut. xii 32 (xiii 1): à la fin d'une série d'ordonnances qu'Israel doit faire: πᾶν ῥῆμα ὃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον, τοῦτο φυλάξῃ ποιεῖν· οὐ προσθήσεις ἐπ' αὐτό, οὐδὲ ἀφελεῖς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ (ici non plus l'hébreu ne donne lieu à des observations).

Il faut faire remarquer (α) que ces paroles ne se trouvent ni au commencement ni à la fin du Deutéronome, du moins dans sa composition actuelle; ainsi ils ne reçoivent pas d'accent spécial. — (β) Ceci se rapporte aux commandements qui ont été donnés; il est défendu de les transgresser arbitrairement: cependant cela ne se dit pas de récits. — (γ) Ici il ne saurait être question de malédiction, comme dans xi 26-28; xxviii 15 et xxx 17-18.

b) Prov. xxiv 29 (LXX xxx:6). *Toute parole de Dieu est éprouvée. Il est un bouclier pour ceux qui cherchent en lui un refuge.* μὴ προσθῇς τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ἐλέγξῃ σε καὶ ψευδὴς γένη. Dans le verset suivant on emploie, il est vrai, le verbum ἀφαιρέω, mais le vs. 7 n'a aucun rapport avec le vs. 6 et dit: μὴ ἀφέλῃς μου χάριν. Il n'y a pas d'antithèse.

⁴⁷ En nous référant à E. Lohmeyer, *op. cit.* et H. Windisch, *Barnabas-brief*, p. 402.

Il faudrait alors juxtaposer: ⁴⁸

c) Jérémie xxvi 2 (LXX xxxiii 2), *toutes les paroles que je t'ordonne de leur dire*, μὴ ἀφέλῃς ῥῆμα (נא).

d) Ecclésiaste iii 14. Ici le texte grec et le texte hébreu sont différents. L'hébreu peut être traduit par: *J'ai reconnu que tout ce que Dieu fait durera toujours, qu'il n'y a rien à y ajouter et rien à en retrancher* (הוּא וְנִשְׁמַר וְנִשְׁמַר וְנִשְׁמַר).

Gemser propose deux possibilités d'explication: ou bien le plan de Dieu est de toute éternité invariable, ou bien tout ce que Dieu fait se répète toujours, cf. vs. 15 et i 9-10.⁴⁹ Vu le contexte c'est la dernière explication qui selon moi serait la meilleure.⁵⁰ La subordonnée est le sujet de la suite. En grec on lit: ἔργων ὅτι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς αὐτὰ ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν προσθεῖναι καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀφελεῖν. Ici c'est donc la deuxième partie de la parole qui se rapporte à Dieu (voir plus bas p. 152). On peut comparer au texte hébreu *Sirach* xviii: 5-6: κράτος μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ τίς ἐξαριθμήσεται; καὶ τίς προσθήσει ⁵¹ ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι τὰ ἐλέη αὐτοῦ; οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλαττωσαί οὐδὲ προσθεῖναι.

Dans ces versets il n'est pas question des „livres” mais des œuvres de Dieu en général ou bien de Dieu lui-même.

e) *Hénoch* 104:10-12. Comme on sait le texte original en est perdu. A côté de la traduction éthiopienne de cette partie qui est connue depuis longtemps et à laquelle on était uniquement réduit autrefois, on possède depuis dix ans également la version grecque.⁵² Voilà qui a fait naître beaucoup de problèmes nouveaux, car les textes sont loins d'être identiques à tous les égards . . . τῆς ἀληθείας ἐξαλλοιοῦσιν καὶ ἀντιγράφουσιν οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ καὶ ἀλλάσσουσιν τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ ψεύδονται καὶ πλάσσουσιν πλάσματα μεγάλα καὶ τὰς γραφὰς ἀναγράφουσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν αὐτῶν· καὶ ὀφελον πάντας τοὺς λόγους μου γράφωσιν ἐπ' ἀληθείας ἐπὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν καὶ μήτε ἀφέλωσιν

⁴⁸ Cela ne se fait nulle part.

⁴⁹ B. Gemser, *Spreuken II, Prediker en Hooglied van Salomo*, dans: *Tekst en Uitleg*, Groningen-den Haag-Batavia 1931, p. 105.

⁵⁰ K. Galling, dans: M. Haller-K. Galling, *Die fünf Megilloth*, Tübingen 1940, p. 62: „Denn alles, was Gott tut, das gehört dem Zeitenablauf an: Dazu wird nichts hinzugetan, und davon wird auch nichts abgetan”.

⁵¹ προσθήσει dans vs. 5 est une construction hébraïque bien connue. Le texte hébreu de ce passage n'a pas été conservé.

⁵² C. Bonner, *The last Chapters of Enoch in Greek*, dans: *Studies and Documents VIII*, London 1937. — il est impossible de discuter la composition du livre d'Enoch, mais il suffit de relever le fait (Bonner, p. 10) que le papyrus grec n'a pas renfermé le livre entier, mais probablement les chapitres 91 sqq.

μήτε ἀλλοιωσωσιν τῶν λόγων τούτων ἀλλὰ πάντα ἐπ' ἀληθείας γράψωσιν ἃ ἐγὼ διαμαρτυροῦμαι αὐτοῖς.⁵³

En effet il s'agit ici d'un livre, mais il ne faut pas perdre de vue que les versets ne servent pas de fin pour tout le livre d'Hénoch, car il en vient encore d'autres: en outre selon le texte grec ce morceau fait partie d'une *Lettre d'Hénoch*, comme on lit dans la souscription du manuscrit.⁵⁴ Il n'est question d'une traduction ni en grec ni en araméen.⁵⁵

Pour avoir une bonne notion il est utile d'observer les faits suivants: (α) on l'appelle le premier „mystère” qui se rapporte aux pécheurs; en outre il y a le second mystère qui suit immédiatement, à savoir que ces livres seront donnés aux justes et aux saints pour la joie de la vérité; ceux-ci s'en réjouiront et apprendront à connaître les voies de la vérité. Les intrigues des pécheurs y sont opposées.

(β) il faut lire cet endroit en rapport avec 99:2, où l'on dit en prédisant le malheur aux pécheurs: οὐαὶ ὑμῖν οἱ ἐξαλλοιοῦντες τοὺς λόγους τοὺς ἀληθινούς καὶ διαστρέφοντες τὴν αἰώνιαν διαθήκην, καὶ λογιζόμενοι ἑαυτοὺς ἀναμαρτήτους· ἐν τῇ γῇ καταποθήσονται et 104:9 les pécheurs auraient tort de croire qu'ils restent inaperçus μὴ πλανᾷσθε τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν μηδὲ ψεύδεσθε μηδὲ ἐξαλλοιώσητε τοὺς λόγους τῆς ἀληθείας. Ici on considère donc une caractéristique général des pécheurs: l'habitude de transformer les paroles de la vérité. L'accent porte sur le mot *transformer*, il n'est pas question de *prosesthai*. Les pécheurs avaient raison de le faire, car cette „lettre” contenait des malédictions à leur adresse; il ne faut pas oublier que pour un Oriental (ainsi que pour un Occidental, voir les nombreuses *Defixionum tabellae*), une malédiction, surtout si elle était écrite, est une réalité terrifiante. Voilà pourquoi ils publient ce livre sous leur nom, mais évidemment — selon leur nature — en le transfor-

⁵³ Traduction de G. Beer, dans: E. Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, Tübingen 1900, vol. II, p. 308: „Ich weiss aber auch dies Geheimnis, dass viele Sünder die Worte der Wahrheit ändern und verdrehen, schlechte Reden führen und lügen, grosse Betrügnisse ersinnen und Bücher über ihre Reden verfassen werden. Aber wenn sie alle meine Worte in ihren Sprachen richtig (ab)schreiben, nichts ändern oder von meinen Worten auslassen, sondern alles richtig (ab)schreiben, alles was ich oben über sie bezeugt habe, dann weiss ich ein anderes Geheimnis: die Bücher werden den Gerechten und Weisen übergeben werden und viel Freude, Rechtschaffenheit und Weisheit verursachen”, cf. R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1913, vol. II, p. 277.

⁵⁴ Bonner, *l.c.*, p. 87.

⁵⁵ Ainsi Charles dans son annotation.

mant, omettant la malédiction etc. L'auteur y joint le vœu qu'ils n'agissent pas de la sorte vu ce qui a été écrit contre eux.⁵⁶ Ce texte apprend donc uniquement quelque chose sur la façon d'agir des pécheurs. On va trop loin en concluant avec Windisch: „Die Apokalyptiker sind also der Überzeugung, dass ihre *Bücher bis auf den Wortlaut heiligen Charakter tragen*”.⁵⁷ En outre nous constatons qu'ici le verbe προστίθημι fait défaut de sorte que la règle ne figure ici en aucun cas *expressis verbis*.

f) *Epistula Aristeae*, § 311. La traduction grecque de l'Ancien Testament (les Septante) ayant été achevée on la lit à haute voix. Les chefs du peuple disent alors: ἐπεὶ καλῶς καὶ ὁσίως διηρμήνυνται καὶ κατὰ πᾶν ἡκριβωμένως, καλῶς ἔχον ἔστιν, ἵνα διαμείνη ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοντα καὶ μὴ γένηται μηδεμία διασκευὴ (310). Tous adhèrent à ces paroles et voilà pourquoi: ἐκέλευσαν διαράσασθαι, καθὼς ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἔστιν, εἴ τις διασκευάσει προστιθεὶς ἢ μεταφέρων τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιούμενος ἀφαίρεσιν, καλῶς τοῦτο πράσσοντες, ἵνα διὰ παντὸς ἀέννα καὶ μένοντα φυλάσσηται.

Pour cette habitude de la malédiction Wendland dans son édition⁵⁸ renvoyait au Deut. iv 2, xii 32, mais nous avons déjà vu sub (a) qu'à cet endroit il ne fut pas question d'une malédiction mais seulement d'un précepte.

D'ailleurs on doit se demander quelle est au juste la signification de καθὼς ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἔστιν. L'auteur relève-t-il le fait qu'il s'agit ici d'une malédiction, comme quelque chose de particulier ou cela se rapporte-t-il à une façon de maudire caractéristique pour les Juifs? La διασκευή c'est l'action d'achever un manuscrit.

Dans cette exaltation de la traduction grecque on veut donc avoir soin que la concordance avec le livre de la révélation de Dieu reste intacte.

La version du récit qu'on lit chez Philon et Josèphe est un peu différente.⁵⁹ Philo *de vita Mosis* II, 6, § 34: ... λογιζάμενοι παρ'

⁵⁶ C. Bonner, *l.c.*, p. 94 traduit ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν aussi bien que ἐπὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν par „in their names”. A mon avis il faut faire une distinction entre les deux prépositions; ἐπὶ + acc. = en vue, cf. Marc ix 12.

⁵⁷ H. Windisch, *Der Apokalyptiker Johannes als Begründer des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, dans: *Zeitschr. neutest. Wissenschaft* X (1909), p. 173.

⁵⁸ *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula*, ed. P. Wendland, Lipsiae 1900, et dans sa traduction dans: Kautzsch, *Apokryphen* II, p. 30, nt. 3. — il est intéressant de comparer la version de Pseudo-Chrysostomus, *in Pascha Homilia* VII 1 (Wendland, p. 166): καὶ ἐδοκιμάσθη ἡ ἐρμηνεία, καὶ ἀραι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν Ἑβραίων ἐτέθησαν, εἴ τις τὴν ἐρμηνείαν παρακινήσειε.

⁵⁹ Ailleurs on ne les cite pas dans ce rapport-ci.

αὐτοῖς, ὅσον εἴη τὸ πρᾶγμα θεσπισθέντας νόμους χρησιμοῖς διερμηνεύειν, μήτ' ἀφελεῖν τι μήτε προσθεῖναι ἢ μεταθεῖναι δυναμένους, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἰδέαν καὶ τὸν τύπον αὐτῶν διαφυλάττοντας. Comme il résulte du contexte il n'est pas question ici du livre achevé, mais on allègue un argument des traducteurs avant qu'ils se missent à l'ouvrage. Cette traduction devait être conforme au texte original sous tous les rapports. Dans les paragraphes 38-40 Philon insiste particulièrement sur la nature divine de cette traduction où l'on a réussi à choisir parmi toutes les possibilités qu'admettait le grec, la seule traduction qui fût parfaitement adéquate. Ici l'accent porte donc sur la nature de la traduction et sur la sûreté absolue et non sur la vigilance contre les „crimes” des copistes.

Josèphe *Antiquitates* XII, 2, 12, § 109 au contraire partage plutôt l'opinion de Ps.-Aristeas. Après la lecture on désire que le livre une fois achevé reste intact. C'est pourquoi ἐκέλευσαν, εἴ τις ἢ περιττόν τι προσγεγραμμένον ὄρᾳ τῷ νόμῳ ἢ λεῖπον, πάλιν ἐπισκοποῦντα τοῦτο καὶ ποιοῦντα φανερόν διορθοῦν, σωφρόνως τοῦτο πράττοντες, ἵνα τὸ κριθέν ἁπλᾶς ἔχειν καλῶς εἰς αἰὶ διαμένῃ. Josèphe donne une autre interprétation. Il s'agit ici d'un dernier contrôle de la traduction: elle doit être jugée pour qu'on puisse éliminer toutes les erreurs qui s'y seraient introduites; ensuite l'ouvrage devait avoir un caractère permanent. Josèphe ne se sert donc pas de la règle recherchée mais offre une périphrase. Pourtant il n'est pas sans la connaître comme il résulte des endroits suivants.⁶⁰

g) Josèphe, *Antiquitates* I introduct. § 17. Après que Josèphe a vanté tout ce que contient l'Ancien Testament et après avoir dit que chez les Juifs il n'était pas πάτριον de rien laisser ἀπόρητον⁶¹ des choses salutaires (§ 11), il ajoute: τὰ μὲν οὖν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀναγραφαῖς προῶν ὁ λόγος κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν τάξιν σημανεῖ· τοῦτο γὰρ διὰ ταύτης ποιήσιν τῆς πραγματείας ἐπηγγελιάμην, οὐδὲν προσθεῖς οὐδ' αὖ παραλιπών. De cette manière Josèphe veut assurer d'avance ses lecteurs de la sûreté absolue de son récit.

h) Josèphe *Contra Apionem* I, 8, § 42. Dans ce rapport il fait ressortir la grandeur de la religion juive dans la pureté du sacerdoce et des écrits saints, que seuls les prophètes pouvaient écrire (τῶν προφητῶν τὰ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ παλαιότατα κατὰ τὴν ἐπίπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ

⁶⁰ Windisch, *Barnabasbrief*, p. 402 cite e.a. Josephus, *Antiq.* XX 11, 2, mais je ne vois aucun rapport.

⁶¹ Une méchanceté contre les mystères grecs; cf. N. M. H. van der Burg, *ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ-ΔΡΩΜΕΝΑ-ΟΡΓΙΑ*, Amsterdam 1939 (diss. Utrecht).

τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων, τὰ δὲ καθ' αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐγένετο σαφῶς συγγραφόντων § 37). Ensuite il parle de cette Ecriture Sainte en affirmant qu'après Artaxerxes on n'a rien ajouté διὰ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τῇν τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχῇ.⁶² § 42 δῆλον δ' ἐστὶν ἔργῳ πῶς ἡμεῖς πρόσκειμεν τοῖς ἰδίῳις γράμμασι· τοσούτου γὰρ αἰῶνος ἤδη παρωχηκότος οὔτε προσθεῖναι τις οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἀφελεῖν αὐτῶν οὔτε μεταθεῖναι τετόλμηκεν. C'est qu'on les considère comme θεοῦ δόγματα, pour lesquels on doit être prêt à mourir. Il estime tout ceci carrément opposé aux écrits grecs.

Ici Josèphe ne parle donc pas de la traduction ou de copies éventuelles mais de l'Ecriture sainte elle-même. Modifier quelque chose dans ces écrits inspirés sous n'importe quelle forme, ce serait montrer une audace que personne n'a encore eue. L'expression implique le caractère divin.

Dans son étude du canon Bousset dit: ⁶³ „In Anlehnung an Dt. iv 2, xiii 1 entstand die Kanonisierungsformel, dass es verboten sei, den heiligen Schriften etwas hinzu zu tun, weg zu nehmen oder zu ändern” en s'autorisant de Josèphe, c. Ap. I, 8, § 42, Ps.-Aristeas 310-311, Apoc. Joh. xxii 19 et Hénoc 104 10-13. Contre cette opinion il y a trois objections. (α) Ce qui est bien curieux, c'est que les autres descriptions de la Théologie des Juifs (judaïsme) ne partagent nulle part cette opinion.⁶⁴ Dans les écrits rabbiniques on trouve comme expression pour canonisation: „des écrits qui souillent les mains”.⁶⁵

(β) En embrassant ces données diverses ⁶⁶ on est forcé de

⁶² Cf. la phrase rabbinique: „depuis que sont morts Haggée, Zacharie et Malachie, qui sont les derniers prophètes, l'Esprit saint (= l'Esprit de l'inspiration) a cessé en Israel”, citée par J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus Christ*, Paris 1935, tom. I, p. 211, nt. 1.

⁶³ W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*³, Tübingen 1926, p. 148.

⁶⁴ On ne la trouve ni chez Schürer, Moore, Bonsirven ni dans G. Wildeboer, *Het Ontstaan van den Kanon des Ouden Verbonds*⁴, Groningen 1908.

⁶⁵ H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1928, vol. IV, p. 433-434.

⁶⁶ Charles et Lohmeyer renvoient à *Hénoc slave* 48:7, mais ce texte n'a rien à y faire (Charles-Forbes dans: Charles, *Apocrypha* II, p. 459: „Thus I make known to you, my children, and distribute the book to your children, into all your generations and amongst the nations who shall have the sense to fear God, let them receive them, and may they come to love them more than any food or earthly sweets, and read them and apply themselves to them. And those who understand not the Lord, who fear not God, who accept not, but reject, who do not receive them (sc. the books), a terrible judgment awaits these”).

reconnaître qu'il ne saurait être question d'un rapport avec le *Deutéronome*, puisque les autres vont beaucoup plus loin. *Le Deut. parle seulement des commandements, mais il ne mentionne ni écrits ni manuscrits en général; il ne parle pas non plus de malédiction.* Dans le Deut. il s'agit d'observer strictement le commandement légal; ailleurs il s'agit de la certitude de la révélation. Ce qui frappe aussi, c'est que la plupart des endroits proviennent de la *sphère hellénistique juive* tout en ayant un *accent apologétique*. Pour le lecteur païen le renvoi à la pureté est une preuve de la vérité, mais dans le cercle de la communauté juive ce ne fut pas le signe d'une origine divine: on n'en doutait plus.

(γ) Un autre inconvénient qui n'est pas à dédaigner: on ne considère pas ici les données dans toute leur étendue. Il faut combler les lacunes par des recherches dans le domaine juif et grec.

Par rapport aux *données rabbiniques*, Billerbeck dans son commentaire sur l'Ap. xxii 18-19 n'a pas grand'chose à souligner. Voilà qui n'est guère encourageant. Il renvoie à

a) *Talmud Babli Megilla*, fol. 14a: „48 Propheten und 7 Prophetinnen haben den Israeliten geweissagt, und sie haben nicht vermindert und nichts vermehrt an dem was in der Tora geschrieben steht (ולא פחתו ולא הויתירו על מה שכתוב בתורה) ausgenommen die Verlesung der Estherrolle (am Purimfeste, wovon die Tora noch nichts weiss“; cf. *Midrash Ruth* 2, 4 (130b): „R. Chelbo (um 300) hat im Namen des R. Schemuel b. Nachman (um 260) gesagt: 85 Älteste, von denen 30 u. mehr Propheten waren, waren in Nöten um diesen Vers: ‘Dies sind die Gebote, welche Jahve dem Mose geboten hat’. Lev. xxvii 34 ‘Dies sind die Gebote’ (also gibt es keine anderen); *man darf nicht hinzufügen u. man darf nicht wegnehmen*, u. kein Prophet ist von da an berechtigt, noch irgend etwas Neues (in der Tora nicht Enthaltene) zu befehlen; u. Mardokhai u. Esther fordern von uns etwas Neues bei uns einzuführen?!“⁶⁷

Le problème en question paraît être une affaire concernant le canon, c.-à-d. la canonisation du livre d'Esther; un problème qui a suscité de vives discussions dans les cercles juifs.⁶⁸ Mais en réalité le problème est situé sur un autre plan. Le pourim, tel qu'Esther le prescrit, est-il obligatoire; en le célébrant, n'ajoute-t-on pas aux commandements de la Tora qui selon la foi juive contient tout elle

⁶⁷ Billerbeck, I, p. 601.

⁶⁸ Billerbeck, IV, p. 429-432.

même? ⁶⁹ Donc il s'agissait de l'application de la règle de Deut. iv 2, xii 32. Il y a une issue, comme montre *Talmud Jerusch. Megilla* I, 70d, 39 sq., où ⁷⁰ selon l'explication d'Exode xvii 4 tout ceci était également compris dans la Tora.

b) *Talmud Babli Rosch Haschana*, fol. 28b: „R. Šamen b. Abba ⁷¹ wandte ein: Woher, dass der auf die Estrade steigende Priester nicht sagen darf: da die Tora mir das Recht erteilt hat Israel zu segnen, so will ich noch einen Segen meinerseits hinzufügen, beispielweise: *der Herr, der Gott euer Väter, möge euch vermehren*. ⁷² Es heisst: *Ihr sollt dazu nicht hinzufügen*“.⁷³

La bénédiction sacerdotale est prescrite mot à mot dans le livre des Nombres vi 22-27. Le prêtre ajouterait-il une bénédiction, il violerait le commandement explicite du Deutéronome iv 2.

c) *Talmud Babli 'Erubin*, fol. 13a = *Soṭa*, fol. 20a:⁷⁴ „R. Jehuda erzählte im Namen Šemuels im Namen R. Meirs: ⁷⁵ Als ich bei R. 'Aqiba lernte, pflegte ich Vitriol in die Tinte zu tun, und er sagte mir nichts, als ich aber [später] zu R. Jišma'el kam, fragte er mich: Mein Sohn, was ist deine Beschäftigung? Ich erwiderte ihm: Ich bin [Tora]schreiber. Da sprach er zu mir: Mein Sohn, sei vorsichtig bei deiner Arbeit, denn sie ist eine Gottesarbeit: *Wenn du nur einen Buchstaben auslassest oder einen Buchstaben zu viel [schreibst]*, zerstörst du die ganze Welt.⁷⁶ Ich erwiderte ihm: Ich habe etwas, das ich in die Tinte tue, es ist Vitriol“. Est-ce permis? „Selbstverständlich bin ich im Schreiben der defekten und vollen [Worte] kundig, aber ich brauche auch nicht zu befürchten, eine Fliege könnte sich auf das Häkchen des *Daleth* setzen, es verwischen und aus diesen ein *Reš* machen, denn ich habe etwas, das ich in die Tinte tue, nämlich Vitriol“.

Pour bien comprendre ce texte il faut se rendre compte que les Juifs n'ont pas tardé à avoir grand soin d'une transmission et d'une graphie exactes de l'Écriture Sainte,⁷⁷ car ce fut de la lettre que

⁶⁹ Billerbeck, I, p. 244 ff.

⁷⁰ Billerbeck, IV, p. 430-431.

⁷¹ ± 270 p.C. (H. L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*⁵, München 1921, p. 141).

⁷² Deut. i 11.

⁷³ Deut. iv 2. — Traduction de Goldschmidt, *Der Babylonische Talmud*, Berlin 1933, vol. III, p. 374.

⁷⁴ Goldschmidt, II, p. 38 = V, p. 239.

⁷⁵ R. Meir ± 150 p.C. (Strack, *Einleitung*, p. 128-129).

⁷⁶ שמא תחסיר אות אחת או תתיר אות אחת נמצאת אתה מחריב את כל העולם כולו

⁷⁷ Billerbeck, IV, p. 130-132.

dépendit l'interprétation, à l'aide de toutes sortes d'expédients ingénieux comme gematria, notarikon etc.⁷⁸ La plus petite différence eut une signification décisive. Cela ne concerne pas seulement l'orthographe „plene ou defective”⁷⁹ de certains mots en hébreu. La structure même de l'hébreu fait qu'une lettre de plus ou de moins peut donner un tout autre mot. „Détruire le monde entier”, c'est blasphémer Dieu. A ce sujet Levy donne quelques exemples assez curieux:⁸⁰ quand on écrit le mot 'emèt (vérité) sans aleph (Jer. x 10), le sens devient: Dieu est mort; quand on ajoute à ודבר אלהים un waw il n'y a pas: Dieu parla, mais les dieux parlent. Quant à la question de Daleth et Resj Goldschmidt appela l'attention sur Deut. vi 4 où „Dieu est un” ('chd) deviendrait „Dieu est un autre” ('chr). Meir écrivit au vitriol, pour que l'écriture pût éventuellement facilement s'effacer.⁸¹

c) Les verbes יסף, גרע qu'on rencontre dans l'Ancien Testament comme les équivalents de ἀφαιρέω et προστίθημι, sont employés dans l'exégèse rabbinique d'une façon très remarquable. On s'en sert pour indiquer une méthode d'exégèse légitime et utile, qui remonte à R. 'Aqiba. „Man darf — zum Zwecke halachischer Deduktion — den Bestandteil eines am Anfange des Abschnittes stehenden Wortes von dort wegnehmen und ihn am Ende des (vorigen?) Abschnittes verwenden” dit Bacher.⁸² Voir p. ex. *Talmud Babli Joma*, 48a גורעין ומוסיפין ודורשין ils ôteraient, ils augmenteraient et examineraient.

d) L'expression „ne pas ajouter — ne pas ôter” s'emploie aussi pour indiquer un nombre déterminé, ainsi nous lisons *Mishnah Megillah* 4, 1: lundi, jeudi et samedi après midi on convoque trois personnes pour lire dans la Tora; on ne les diminue ni ne les augmente:⁸³ le jour de sabbat ils sont sept, pas moins, mais plus;

⁷⁸ Sur les méthodes d'exégèse appliquées par les juifs voir W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*, Leipzig 1899-1905 et J. Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne*, Paris 1939.

⁷⁹ Les lettres waw et jod servent aussi de voyelles et peuvent s'écrire oui ou non.

⁸⁰ J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*², Wien 1924, vol. I, p. 224, 411, vol. II, p. 91.

⁸¹ L. Blau, *Studien zum althebräischen Buchwesen*, Strassburg 1902 n'offra rien de spécial.

⁸² Bacher, II, p. 35; Levy, I, p. 362-363, s.v. גרש; Bonsirven, *Exégèse* p. 188-195.

⁸³ קורין שלשה אין פוחתין ואין מוסיפין עליהן

Pesachim 47a on mange le pain de proposition le neuvième, dixième ou onzième jour, „sans diminution et sans augmentation”.⁸⁴

e) Une fois seule on rencontre l'expression aussi en rapport avec des traductions. *Tosephta Megilla* 4, 41 (229, 1): „Der Dolmetsch, der vor dem Gelehrten steht, ist nicht berechtigt *etwas wegzunehmen oder hinzuzufügen oder zu ändern*” excepté le nom de son père en „mon père”: לא לפחות לא ראשי אינו חכם לפני תורגמן העומד לשנות ולא להוסיף ולא להורסו. Par cette expression on veut donc maintenir ici l'exactitude de la traduction. Dans ce rapport il faut appeler l'attention sur le fait que — pour autant que je sache — l'on reproche à la critique rabbinique postérieure sur les LXX d'avoir introduit des changements dans le texte mais qu'on ne se sert pas du terme examiné par nous.⁸⁵

En résumant il faut donc dire que le contraste „ne pas ajouter — ne pas diminuer” se rencontre dans plusieurs rapports:

(a) par rapport aux commandements; (b) à l'égard de la graphie spécifique de l'hébreu,⁸⁶ où une erreur peut se trouver être sacrilège: pourtant on ne prononce pas de malédiction, puisqu'on savait très bien que personne n'oserait le faire de son chef; (c) une règle d'exégèse légitime, qui selon la conception juive ne changeait rien à la *littera scripta*; (d) et (e) pour garantir la précision.

Avant de discuter les textes grecs, qui abondent, nous voulons faire remarquer un parallèle très curieux et très ancien dans la littérature de sagesse égyptienne.

Dans la *Doctrine de Ptahhotep* (probablement 2000 avant Jésus Christ et remaniée dans le Moyen Empire) on lit: „*Nimm kein Wort weg und füge keines hinzu und setze auch keines an die Stelle eines anderen*”.⁸⁷ Le traducteur Erman ajoute d'un ton légèrement cynique: „eine Mahnung, die das Buch freilich nicht vor der völligen Umarbeitung geschützt hat”.

La *Doctrine de Dwauf* (conservée au moyen de papyrus datant de 1300 av. J. Chr. environ) donne une admonition analogue qui en rapporte à la transmission d'un message: „Wenn dich ein Grosser mit einer Botschaft schickt, so richte sie so aus, wie er sie sagt; *nimm nichts davon fort und füge nichts dazu*”.⁸⁸

⁸⁴ לא פחות ולא יותר

⁸⁵ Billerbeck, IV, p. 407-408.

⁸⁶ Pour les langues indo-germaniques dont la structure et l'orthographe sont tout à fait différentes, cela ne compte pas.

⁸⁷ A. Erman, *Die Literatur der Aegypten*, Leipzig 1923, p. 98.

⁸⁸ Erman, p. 105.

Dans la région de *la langue grecque* on rencontre très souvent l'un à côté de l'autre les mots ἀφαιρέω et προστίθημι. Les textes qui contiennent les deux verbes ne sont pas tous importants en vue de notre recherche. Lorsque W. Baur p. e. renvoie à Epictète, *Diss.* I, 6, 10,⁸⁹ cela prouve la puissance absolue de l'intelligence humaine, mais ne contribue rien à la solution du problème qui nous occupe ici.⁹⁰ Le fait que chez les mathématiciens⁹¹ ces verbes ont le sens de „additionner” et de „soustraire” et chez les grammairiens⁹² celui d’„ôter” et d’„ajouter” des lettres n'éclaircit pas la question.

a) Il est évident qu'on cherchera les termes dans le monde de la librairie antique. Pensant à la façon dont les écrits antiques furent trop souvent traités,⁹³ on pourrait très bien comprendre ces efforts d'un auteur pour garantir de la sorte son œuvre contre la mutilation, la destruction ou l'abus. En effet cela se présente mais rarement.

α) Irénée à la fin de son écrit: Περὶ ὀγδοάδος (ap. Eusèbe, *H.E.* V, 20, 2): ὀρκίζω σε τὸν μεταγραφόμενον τὸ βιβλίον τοῦτο κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ κατὰ τῆς ἐνδόξου παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, ἧς ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ἵνα ἀντιβάλῃς ὁ μετεγράψω καὶ κατορθώσῃς αὐτὸ πρὸς τὸ ἀντίγραφον τοῦτο, ὅθεν μετεγράψω, ἐπιμελῶς. καὶ τὸν ὄρκον τοῦτον ὁμοίως μεταγράψεις, καὶ θήσεις ἐν τῷ ἀντιγράφῳ. Bien que ce texte ne renferme pas l'expression en question nous l'avons inséré ici parce que Lohmeyer l'a cité.⁹⁴ On insiste sur la fidélité du copiste sous menace d'une malédiction.

L'écrit lui-même est perdu et on en ignore le contenu. Bardenhewer vit dans le ὀγδοάς „die valentinianische Äonenachtzahl”, parce que Florinus à qui il était adressé avait embrassé la doctrine

⁸⁹ W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, col. 1199, s.v. προστίθημι.

⁹⁰ Epictetus, *Dissert.* I, 6, 10 ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη τῆς διανοίας κατασκευή, καθ' ἣν οὐχ ἀπλῶς ὑποπίπτοντες τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς τυπούμεθα ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκλαμβάνομεν τι καὶ ἀφαιροῦμεν καὶ προστίθεμεν καὶ συντίθεμεν τάδε τινὰ δι' αὐτῶν καὶ νῆ Δία μεταβαίνομεν ἀπ' ἄλλων ἐπ' ἄλλα τινὰ οὕτω πως παρακείμενα, οὐδὲ ταῦτα ἱκανὰ κινῆσαι τινὰς καὶ διατρέψαι πρὸς τὸ ἀπολιπεῖν τὸν τεχνίτην; Non plus Plutarchus, *Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur* 28 ὁ δὲ παρερησίαν καὶ δηγμὸν ἀνθρώπων δυστυχοῦντι προσάγων ὥσπερ ὀξυδορκικὸν ὄμματι ταραττομένῳ καὶ φλεγμαίνοντι, θεραπεύει μὲν οὐδέν, οὐδὲ ἀφαιρεῖ τοῦ λυποῦντος, ὀργὴν δὲ τῇ λύπῃ προστίθῃσι καὶ παροξύνει τὸν ἀνιώμενον.

⁹¹ Par exemple: F. G. Kenyon, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, London 1898, vol. II, p. 257-264, no. CCLXV.

⁹² H. Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, ed. C. B. Hase, G. & L. Dindorf, Parisiis 1831-1856, vol. I 2, col. 2600.

⁹³ Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, Berlin 1882, p. 371 ff.

⁹⁴ Lohmeyer, *Offenbarung*, p. 179.

de Valentin.⁹⁵ *Daniélou* paraît croire que ce mot se rapporte à une chronologie eschatologique.⁹⁶ On ne saurait trancher la question. Des deux façons il est clair qu'Irénée voulait faire son possible pour que tout fût transmis exactement sans qu'on lui attribuât des opinions d'autrui (voir p. 6-7).

En tout cas une pareille fin ne paraît pas avoir été dans l'usage car Eusèbe la fait ressortir comme un fait remarquable. Les autres écrits d'Irénée lui-même ne l'ont pas. Il doit avoir eu des raisons spéciales.

β) Artémidore,⁹⁷ *Oneirocriticon* II, 70: δέομαι δὲ ὀλίγα τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων τοῖς βιβλίοις μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε τι τῶν ὄντων ἀφελεῖν. εἴτε γὰρ δύναιτό τις τοῖς ἑμοῖς προσθεῖναι, ῥᾶον ἂν ἴδια ποιήσειεν· εἴτε τινὰ τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων ταῖσδε ταῖς βίβλοις περισσὰ δοκεῖ, οἷς ἀρέσκεται μόνοις χρήσθω τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων μὴ ἐξαιρῶν, θεὸν ἐπόπτην καὶ φύλακα πάντων νομίζων τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα, ὃ πειθόμενος ἐγὼ πατρώῳ ὄντι θεῷ εἰς τήνδε τὴν πραγματείαν παρῆλθον, πολλάκις με προτρεψαμένῳ μάλιστα δὲ νῦν ἐναργῶς ἐπιστάντι μοι, ἥνίκα σοι ἐγνωρίσθην καὶ μονονοῦχῃ κελεύσαντι ταῦτα συγγράψαι.

Ici l'auteur voulait donc garantir son œuvre contre la mutilation; précisément dans ce terrain semi-religieux des abus abondaient. Il se croit élu par la divinité, voilà pourquoi il défend l'intégrité de son œuvre de façon assez débonnaire en ce qui concerne l'adjonction; en cas d'omission cependant il menace de la vengeance terrible d'Apolon. Dans ce passage on trouve la règle, que nous avons trouvée dans le domaine juif et chrétien, dans un milieu païen. Il est donc également connu là où l'on ne saurait y voir l'influence de *Deut.*: c'est du grec pur. Un parallèle curieux s'impose avec Apoc. xxii 18-19. Pricaeus, un commentateur du 17^{me} siècle, y a déjà appelé l'attention,⁹⁸ mais cette sagesse a dû se perdre, car dans les commentaires modernes on ne renvoie nulle part à ce parallèle frappant.

Il existe donc quelques traces, qui paraissent renvoyer à l'art antique d'éditer. Pourtant dans ce rapport le terme n'est pas d'usage. Dans la littérature sur ce sujet on chercherait en vain l'existence et l'emploi de la règle μὴ προσθεῖναι μὴ ἀφελεῖν. Si l'on s'en sert cela reste une exception. L'origine doit se trouver ailleurs.

⁹⁵ Bardenhewer, I, p. 414.

⁹⁶ J. Daniélou, *La typologie millénariste de la semaine*, dans: *Vigiliae Christianae* II (1948), p. 10.

⁹⁷ ± 130 p.Chr., originaire d'Ephèse.

⁹⁸ Pricaeus, dans: *Critici Sacri*, Amstelodami-Ultrajecti 1698, vol. VIII, col. 616.

b) Dans *Platon* les verbes ἀφαιρέω et προστίθμι (ou variantes) se rencontrent neuf fois ensemble.⁹⁹ *Parménide* X, 131 D n'a pas de valeur pour notre examen, la signification étant là : „soustraire et additionner”. Ce qui nous intéresse ce sont les passages suivants :

α) *Phaedo* 95 E: Καὶ ἐξέπιτηδες πολλάκις ἀναλαμβάνω, ἵνα μὴ τι διαφύγῃ ἡμᾶς, εἴ τί τι βούλει, προσθῆς ἢ ἀφέλῃς;¹⁰⁰ Cébès répond : οὐδὲν ἔγωγε ἐν τῷ παρόντι ... οὔτε ἀφελεῖν οὔτε προσθεῖναι δέομαι· ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα ἃ λέγω.

Cela se dit à la fin d'une discussion. Socrate veut donc fournir l'occasion d'apporter des corrections, mais Cébès, sûr de son affaire, n'en a pas besoin.

β) *Théétète* 155 A: Socrate parle de son point de départ. Le second axiome est ὃ μῆτε προστιθοῖτο μῆτε ἀφαιροῖτο, τοῦτο μῆτε αὐξάνεσθαι ποτε μῆτε φθίνειν, αἰεὶ δὲ ἶσον εἶναι.

γ) Dans le *Cratyle* Socrate s'oppose à ceux qui croient que cela ne fait rien s'il manque une lettre ou non (εἰ πρόσκειται τι γράμμα ἢ ἀφῆρηται) tant que la nature de la chose demeure intacte. Lorsque plus tard Hermogène s'informe de la signification de ζημιῶδες, Socrate dit : „Regardez à quel point mes paroles sont vraies quand je dis ὅτι προστιθέντες γράμματα καὶ ἐξαιροῦντες σφόδρα ἀλλοιοῦσι τὰς τῶν ὀνομάτων διανοίας, οὕτως ὥστε σμικρὰ πάνυ παραστρέφοντες ἐνίτε τάναντία ποιεῖν σημαίνειν (418 A).¹⁰¹

Dans le *Cratyle* 431 C-D, 432 A il remet l'affaire en question. Il y compare les mots avec des images ; complètes ou incomplètes ἐνία ἐλλείπειν, ἐνία δὲ καὶ προστιθέναι. Celui qui reproduit tout, fait [de bonnes images ὁ δὲ ἢ προστιθεὶς ἢ ἀφαιρῶν γράμματα μὲν καὶ εἰκόνας ἐργάζεται καὶ οὗτος, ἀλλὰ πονηράς. Lorsque Cratyle y consent, Socrate continue que lorsque personne πάντα ἀποδοῖ τὰ προσήκοντα, l'image c.-à-d. la parole, sera bonne ; ἐὰν δὲ σμικρὰ ἐλλείπῃ ἢ προστιθῇ ἐνίτε, εἰκὼν μὲν γενήσεται, καλὴ δὲ οὐ. C'est pourquoi certains noms sont bons et d'autres mauvais. Le nom

⁹⁹ Suivant l'index d'Ast.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. la règle de Plutarque, *De recta ratione audiendi* 4 (39 C) : ἀλλ' ὥς Αἰσχίνης φησί, διαλείπη χρόνον, εἴτε προσθεῖναι τι βούλοιο τοῖς λελεγμένοις ὁ εἰρηκῶς εἴτε μεταθέσθαι καὶ ἀφελεῖν.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Xenophon, *De republica Atheniensium* III 8-9 τούτων τοίνυν τοιούτων ὄντων οὐ φημι οἶόν τ' εἶναι ἄλλως ἔχειν τὰ πράγματα Ἀθήνησιν ἢ ὥσπερ νῦν ἔχει πλὴν εἰ κατὰ μικρόν τι οἶόν τε τὸ μὲν ἀφελεῖν, τὸ δὲ προσθεῖναι. πολὺ δ' οὐχ οἶόν τε μετακινεῖν, ὥστε μὴ οὐχὶ τῆς δημοκρατίας ἀφαιρεῖν τι. ὥστε μὲν γὰρ βέλτιον ἔχειν τὴν πολιτείαν οἶόν τε πολλὰ ἐξευρεῖν, ὥστε μέντοι ὑπάρχειν δημοκρατίαν μὲν εἶναι, ἀρκοῦντως δὲ τοῦτο ἐξευρεῖν, ὅπως δὴ βέλτιον πολιτεύσονται οὐ ῥᾶδιον, πλὴν ὅπερ ἄρτι εἶπον κατὰ μικρόν τι προσθέντα ἢ ἀφελόντα.

de l'artiste qui s'en occupe, fut: législateur; certains législateurs firent bien, d'autres mal. Cratyle y consent tout en faisant remarquer que dans la science grammaticale on attribue des lettres aux noms: ἐάν τι ἀφέλωμεν ἢ προσθῶμεν ἢ μεταθῶμέν τι le nom ne s'écrit pas, mais est faux: même on n'a rien écrit du tout, mais il se pourrait qu'on obtint un nouveau mot.

Il paraît donc que dans le raisonnement philosophique le terme s'emploie pour indiquer quelque changement. Quand cela se produisait il y eut quelque chose qui clochait; le mot changeait de nature, signifiait peut-être le contraire de ce qu'il exprimait à l'origine. Là seul où l'on n'ôtait ni ajoutait, la chose demeurait tout à fait intacte.

On a affaire ici à autre chose qu'à une formule, née fortuitement dans l'argumentation, mais l'expression était proverbiale, comme il résulte de

c) Aristote, *Ethica Nicomachea* II, 6, 9-10 (p. 1106 B). Il dit dans une parenthèse: εἰώθασιν ἐπιλέγειν τοῖς εὔ ἔχουσιν ἔργοις ὅτι οὗτ' ἀφελεῖν ἔστιν οὔτε προσθεῖναι, ὡς τῆς μὲν ὑπερβολῆς καὶ τῆς ἐλλείψεως φθειρούσης τὸ εὔ, τῆς δὲ μεσότητος σωζούσης.

Une chose perdait donc son caractère d'être achevé, normal, si l'on y ajoutait ou si on en ôtait quoi que ce soit. Ce qu'on a parfois considéré comme l'idéal grec d'équilibre et d'harmonie, μηδὲν ἄγαν, s'y trouve exprimé, comme il résulte de:

d) Isocrate, *Oratio* 12, 264: Ταῦτ' εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς παρόντας ἀξιώσαντος ἀποφήνασθαι, περὶ ὧν παρεκλήθησαν οὐκ ἔθορύβησαν, ὁ ποιεῖν εἰώθασιν ἐπὶ τοῖς χαριέντως διειλεγμένοις, ἀλλ' ἀνεβόησαν ὡς ὑπερβαλλόντως εἰρηκότος, καὶ περιστάντες αὐτὸν ἐπῆνουν, ἐζήλουν, ἐμακάριζον, καὶ προσθεῖναι μὲν οὐδὲν εἶχον τοῖς εἰρημένοις οὐδ' ἀφελεῖν, συναπεφαίνοντο δὲ καὶ συνεβούλευόν μοι ποιεῖν ἅπερ ἐκεῖνος παρήνευσεν. Cet orateur a donc atteint l'apogée non seulement au point de vue formel, mais en tout. Les trois verbes ἐπῆνουν, ἐζήλουν, ἐμακάριζον expriment aussi fortement que possible la disposition d'une adhésion absolue. La règle exprime qu'on le juge „parfait”.

e) Plutarque, *Vita Lycurgi* vi 4 parle de la législation de Lycurgue et fait savoir que l'assemblée nationale n'eut rien d'autre à faire qu'à accepter les décisions des chefs ou qu'à les rejeter. Plus tard on ne s'en contente plus, mais apporta des amendements; un spécimen de démocratie qu'on n'appréciait guère, comme il résulte des paroles de Plutarque: ὕστερον μέντοι τῶν πολλῶν ἀφαιρέσει καὶ

προσθέσει τὰς γνώμας διαστρεφόντων καὶ παραβιαζομένων. Par là la γνώμη change donc de caractère. Les rois Polydore et Théopompe auraient ajouté alors une clause à la loi de Lycurgue: αἱ δὲ σκολιὰν ὁ δῆμος ἔλοιτο κτλ.

On voit donc quel effet destructeur Plutarque attribua à ce ἀφελεῖν καὶ προσθεῖναι. Ce qui est encore curieux, c'est un autre passage dans la même *Vita Lycurgi* xiii 2 où Plutarque signale comme une grande curiosité que le législateur spartiate ne donna pas de lois écrites. Comme raison il allègue que selon Lycurgue les grandes affaires qui concernaient la prospérité de l'état et la vertu devaient être inculquées dans le ἥθος des bourgeois pour rester ἀκίνητα καὶ βέβαια, le libre choix étant un lien plus fort que la contrainte; les petites affaires qui variaient selon le cas ne devaient être fixées par écrit ni dans ἔγγραφοι ἀνάγκαι ni dans ἀκίνητα ἔθῃ, on devait pouvoir les modifier selon les circonstances en tenant compte de l'opinion des gens bien élevés (ἐὰν ἐπὶ τῶν καιρῶν προσθέσεις λαμβάνοντα καὶ ἀφαιρέσεις).

On peut donc conclure que les lois écrites n'admettaient pas ces modifications. Ces lois selon les Anciens étaient d'origine divine. „Y changer une lettre, y déplacer un mot, en altérer le rythme, c'eût été détruire la loi elle-même”.¹⁰² Là où l'on „ôte ou ajoute”, on profane le caractère divin, comme il résulte d'un certain nombre de textes dont il ne fut pas encore question, c.-à-d. *l'emploi dans la rédaction de traités*.

f) Dans *Thucydide* V, 18, 23 et 47, il se trouve un nombre de traités qu'Athènes fit avec d'autres peuples. On scella ces stipulations d'un serment ἐμμενῶ ταῖς συνθήκαις καὶ ταῖς σπονδαῖς ταῖςδε δικαίως καὶ ἀδόλως. Dans plusieurs temples comme à Olympe, à Delphes on érigea des stèles. Dans ces traités placés sous les auspices d'une sanction divine on inséra une clause qui permit le changement.¹⁰³

Dans V, 23, 6 elle est formulée ainsi: ἦν δέ τι δοκῇ Λακεδαιμονίοις

¹⁰² Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité antique*, Paris, s.d., p. 224; cf. M. Mühl, *Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen und althellenischen Gesetzgebung*, Leipzig 1933, p. 84-88: die Göttlichkeit des Gesetzgebers und seines Werks, p. 88-95: die Unveränderlichkeit des Gesetzes (dans ces pages la formule n'est pas citée).

¹⁰³ G. Humbert, *Foedus*, dans: Ch. Daremberg-E. Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, Paris 1896, tom. 2, p. 1208; G. Busolt-H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*³, 2. Hälfte, München 1926, p. 1253.

καὶ Ἀθηναίοις προσθεῖναι καὶ ἀφελεῖν περὶ τῆς ξυμμαχίας, ὃ τι ἂν δοκῇ, εὖορκον ἀμφοτέροις εἶναι.¹⁰⁴

Ces formules restaient en usage. Dans Polybe, *Historia* XXI, 42, 27 on dit au sujet du traité de paix entre Antioche et Rome en 189: ἐὰν δέ τι θέλωσι πρὸς τὰς συνθήκας ἀμφότεροι κοινῶ δόγματι προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφαιρεθῆναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἐξέστω.¹⁰⁵

Dans son „Imperium Romanum” Täubler a soumis les traités à un examen stylistique.¹⁰⁶ Outre les traités cités il en discute encore d'autres c.-à-d. un traité de Rome avec Kibyra (188), Methymna (129?; le texte est assez endommagé) et Astipalaia (105).¹⁰⁷ Il juge cette stipulation „formelhaft erstarrt” et originaire d'une époque où un traité général ne fut pas généralement d'usage. Il estime certain qu'il s'agit là d'une influence grecque.¹⁰⁸

Dans ce rapport il faut remarquer qu'on parle également de cet usage dans les LXX, savoir danses I *Macchabées* viii 30, un texte, dont Täubler a fait mention, il est vrai, dans la discussion sur le droit des traités, mais qui n'est cité nulle part dans l'histoire du canon. On lit: ἐὰν δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τοῦτους βουλευσῶνται οὗτοι καὶ οὗτοι προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφελεῖν, ποιήσονται ἐξαιρέσεως αὐτῶν, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν προσθεῶσιν ἢ ἀφέλωσιν ἔσται κύρια.¹⁰⁹ Ici encore τὸ μνημόσυνον εἰρήνης καὶ συμμαχίας est érigé au temple de Jérusalem (I Macc. viii 22). Quant à la bonne rédaction il se présente des difficultés, ce texte ayant été traduit plus d'une fois. L'authenticité même fut révoquée en doute, mais ces questions n'ont aucun intérêt par rapport à nos recherches.¹¹⁰ Pour nous il importe de

¹⁰⁴ Cf. V 18, 11 εἰ δέ τι ἀμνημονοῦσιν ὁποτεροιοῦν καὶ ὅτου πέρι, λόγοις δικαίοις χρωμένοις εὖορκον εἶναι ἀμφοτέροις ταύτῃ μεταθεῖναι, ὅπη ἂν δοκῇ ἀμφοτέροις et V 47, 12 (partiel): ἐὰν δέ τι δοκῇ ἄμεινον εἶναι ταῖς πόλεσι ταύταις προσθεῖναι πρὸς τοῖς ξυγκειμένοις, ὅτι ἂν δόξῃ ταῖς πόλεσιν ἀπάσαις κοινῇ βουλευομέναις, τοῦτο κύριον εἶναι.

¹⁰⁵ Polybius, III 25, 2 (entre Rome et Carthage): τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τηροῦσι πάντα κατὰ τὰς ὑπαρχούσας ὁμολογίας, πρόσκειται δὲ τούτοις τὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα.

¹⁰⁶ E. Täubler, *Imperium Romanum, Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des römischen Reichs*, vol. I *Die Staatsverträge und Vertragsverhältnisse*, Leipzig-Berlin 1913, p. 58-62.

¹⁰⁷ Ce texte est cité par J. H. Moulton-G. Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, London 1930, p. 248, s.v. ἐπιτίθημι, mais les auteurs savants n'en ont pas vu le caractère fixe et juridique.

¹⁰⁸ Täubler, p. 61 et 421.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. la version de Josephus, *Antiq.* XII 418 ἂν δέ τι πρὸς ταύτην τὴν συμμαχίαν θελήσῃ τὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ἢ προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφελεῖν τοῦτο κοινῇ γινέσθω γνώμη τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων· ὃ δ' ἂν προστεθῇ, τοῦτ' εἶναι κύριον.

¹¹⁰ Voir E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, Leipzig 1901, vol. I, p. 219-221 et Täubler, p. 239-254.

fixer qu'une clause de changement a été liée à la συνθήκη. Il était défendu de changer arbitrairement quelque chose à ce qui avait été affirmé par serment, exprimé par προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφελεῖν. Des modifications pouvant être nécessaires, on inséra un paragraphe spécial pour régler la procédure, de sorte que l'adjonction et l'omission auraient la validité légale (εὐορκον-κύριον).

g) Finalement il faut faire attention à l'emploi qu'on rencontre chez *Philon*, la juxtaposition des verbes se présentant chez lui à plusieurs reprises.¹¹¹ Ce philosophe aussi versé dans la civilisation grecque que dans la culture juive est pour notre examen de la première importance.

α) Dans *De Aeternitate Mundi* 22, § 113 (C.W. VI, p. 107) il allègue comme preuve de ceux qui croient le monde éternel e.a.: φθορᾶς τέτταρας εἶναι τρόπους τοὺς ἀνωτάτω συμβέβηκε, πρόσθεσιν, ἀφαίρεσιν, μετάθεσιν, ἀλλοίωσιν· δυάς μὲν οὖν προσθέσει μονάδος εἰς τριάδα φθείρεται μηκέτι μένουσα δυάς, τετράς δ' ἀφαίρεσει μονάδος εἰς τριάδα, μεταθήσει δὲ τὸ I στοιχεῖον εἰς H ... κατ' ἀλλοίωσιν δὲ μεταβάλλων οἶνος εἰς ὄξος. (§ 114) τῶν δὲ κατελεγεμένων τρόπων οὐδεὶς ἐφάπτεται τοῦ κόσμου τὸ παράπαν. Par la suite il y donne son adhésion.

πρόσθεσις et ἀφαίρεσις signifient donc ici „additionner” et „soustraire”. Mais on a en vue davantage qu'un simple terme arithmétique. On les voit comme une atteinte au caractère des choses: ce sont des formes de φθορά,¹¹² parfaitement en rapport avec ce que nous avons trouvé plus haut dans la langue des philosophes grecs (p. 146 s.).¹¹³

β) *De Specialibus Legibus* IV, *De Iustitia* 2 (143-147), C.W. V, 241-242. Θαυμασιώτατον δὲ κακεῖνο διαγορεύει τὸ μηδὲν προστιθέναι καὶ ἀφαιρεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἴσῳ καὶ ὁμοίῳ διαφυλάττειν ἀκίνητα τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὀρισθέντα νόμιμα. συμβαίνει γάρ, ὡς ἔοικε, τὴν μὲν πρόσθεσιν τῶν ἀδίκων, <τὴν δὲ ἀφαίρεσιν γίνεσθαι τῶν δικαίων>· οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν ὃ παραλέλειπται τῷ σοφῷ νομοθέτῃ πρὸς ὀλοκλήρου καὶ παντελοῦς μετουσίαν δικαιοσύνης. αἰνίττεται μέντοι καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς ἀκρότητας· ἐκάστη γὰρ αὐτῶν ἀνελλιπής ἐστι καὶ πλήρης, τὸ ἐντελὲς ἔχουσα ἐξ αὐτῆς, ὡς, εἰ γένοιτο προσθήκη τις καὶ ἀφαίρεσις ὅλην

¹¹¹ L'*Index* de Leisegang cite les substantifs, mais non les verbes; voir plus haut.

¹¹² Le sens dualiste métaphysique de φθορά est bien connu.

¹¹³ E. R. Goodenough, *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, New Haven 1940, p. 60: „the book as a whole is written from the point of view of a Platonist and Aristotelian who resents the doctrines of the Stoics”.

δι' ὧν τρέπεσθαι καὶ μεταβάλλεσθαι πρὸς τὴν ἐναντίαν ἔξιν. Comme exemple Philon cite la ἀνδρεία. Si quelqu'un cède à l'ignorance pour se vanter: ὥς δὴ περιττὸς καὶ ἱκανὸς ἐπανορθοῦσθαι τὰ ἀνεπιδεᾶ, προστιθέναι ἢ ἀφαιρεῖν τι τολμᾶ, σύμπασαν ἀλλάσσει τὴν εἰκόνα μετατυπώσας αἰσχροὺν ἀντὶ καλοῦ χαρακτῆρος· ἀπεργάσεται γὰρ τῇ μὲν προσθήσει θρασύτητα, τῇ δ' ἀφαίρεσει δειλίαν. Il démontre la même chose à la reine des vertus: εὐσέβεια: προσθῇ τις ὁτιοῦν μικρὸν ἢ μέγα ἢ τοῦναντίον ἀφέλῃ, καθ' ἑκάτερον ἐπαλλάξει καὶ μεταμορφώσει τὸ εἶδος· γεννήσει γὰρ ἢ μὲν πρόσθεσις δεισιδαιμονίαν, ἢ δὲ ἀφαίρεσις ἀσέβειαν, ἀφανισθείσης αὖ τῆς εὐσεβείας.

Heinemann en dit: „Warnungen vor Übertreibung wie Sp. L. IV, 145 ff. sind gemeinhellenistisch”.¹¹⁴ Cette caractérisation ne me paraît pas juste, puisqu'il ne s'agit pas uniquement d'exagération. Ici comme ailleurs¹¹⁵ le point de départ de Philon est une parole de l'Écriture, c.-à-d. Deut. iv 2, xii 32. L'effet et la description révèlent la pensée grecque (ἐν ἴσῳ . . . ἀκίνητα) tandis-que la deuxième partie a été entièrement inspirée par Platon: le caractère, εἰκὼν d'un objet change complètement si l'on ôte ou ajoute. Ce qui frappe c'est qu'on le considère comme un délit (τολμᾶ). Philon exprime ici nettement les pensées qui chez les philosophes grecs furent liées à la combinaison προσθεῖναι καὶ ἀφελεῖν.

γ) Dans la discussion: *De Sacrificiis Abel et Cain* 1-2, § 1-7, C.W. I, p. 202-204 les mots se rencontrent à plusieurs reprises l'un à côté de l'autre, mais ce passage ne jette pas de lumière sur notre thème (ajouter une chose signifie: en retrancher une autre.¹¹⁶ Il est vrai qu'on dit de Moïse, § 8, qu'il ne mourut pas comme les autres hommes μήτε πρόσθεσιν μήτε ἀφαίρεσιν κεχωρηκώς; ainsi Philon veut indiquer que le sage est estimé par Dieu comme le „kosmos”. Moïse n'était pas seulement doué de qualités de roi, mais on l'appelle aussi „Dieu” (Exod. vii 1): Θεὸς δὲ ἔλλειψιν ἢ πρόσθεσιν οὐκ ἀνέχεται πλήρης καὶ ἰσαίτατος ὢν ἑαυτῷ (§ 9, C.W. I, p. 206). De la φύσις Philon dit aussi (ibid. 30, § 98), qu'elle est ἀφαίρεσιν ἢ πρόσθεσιν οὐκ ἐπιδεχομένη.

En résumant nous pouvons donc constater que l'expression προσθεῖναι καὶ ἀφελεῖν ou le contraire de la règle fut très fréquente

¹¹⁴ I. Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung*, Breslau 1932, p. 546, nt. 7.

¹¹⁵ Dans son *De Iustitia* 1 Philon offre un „commentaire” sur Deut. vi 6 sqq.

¹¹⁶ Cf. *De Fuga et Inventione* 23 (128), C.W. IV 137.

dans la région grecque. Une seule fois on rencontre des synonymes ou un développement, mais en général c'est une locution fixe. Aristote dit *expressis verbis* que c'était une expression proverbiale. C'est plus que l'union de deux verbes contraires qui s'adopte au contexte. On ne s'en sert pas simplement pour amener des corrections. Cela signifie qu'on violait l'essence des choses. Où cela ne se fit pas, la chose répondait à la plus haute norme; dans ce cas-là tout était „bon”, „achevée”, elle fut immobile et resta la même; on eut la certitude de ne pas être induit en erreur. L'expression a une tendance générale et peut s'appliquer à toutes sortes de choses. Ce qui frappe beaucoup c'est que nous la rencontrons surtout comme un terme fixe dans des textes de traités (συνθῆκαι). Ceux-ci étaient surveillés par les dieux et étaient affirmés par serment. Celui qui spontanément y introduit des changements dans un sens quelconque, s'expose à la colère des dieux. Chez Philon l'expression est employée pour l'être divin lui-même. Evidemment il fallait de l'audace pour ajouter ou ôter quelque chose, puisque l'essence dépendait de l'autorité divine et que tout changement impliquait la corruption.

Dans ce rapport il ne faut pas perdre de vue que parmi les textes trouvés chez les auteurs juifs il y en avait beaucoup qui étaient originaires du monde hellénistique juif et avaient un caractère apologétique (p. 19). Il n'est pas clair comment il faut expliquer cet usage très général du Deut. iv 2, xii 32, où il ne se rapporte qu'aux commandements, donc à un cas concret. Les textes grecs qui parlent précisément du danger de nuire à l'essence même démontrent clairement que Ps-Aristéas, Philon et Josèphe en acceptant le terme, pouvaient compter sur l'intelligence de leurs lecteurs formés à l'école hellénistique.

Quant à l'Ecclésiaste iii 14 qui dans l'Ancien Testament nous offre l'énonciation la plus générale, il faut remarquer qu'ici une influence indirecte du grec ne saurait s'exclure. Il est vrai qu'on est revenu de l'idée que dans ce livre la pensée grecque serait présente,¹¹⁷ mais pourtant on suppose que sous l'influence de l'esprit du siècle „toutes sortes d'expressions et l'esprit même de l'Ecclésiaste rappellent les paroles et les considérations des auteurs et des penseurs grecs et des écoles philosophiques”.¹¹⁸ Ce qui est vraiment

¹¹⁷ W. Swart, *De invloed van den Griekschen geest op de boeken Spreuken, Prediker, Job*, Groningen 1908 (diss.) n'a pas discuté ce texte.

¹¹⁸ Gemser, *Spreuken* II, p. 110, cf. Galling, p. 48-49. — On date l'Ecclésiaste à la fin du troisième siècle avant Jésus Christ. Les juifs ont canonisé le livre après de longues hésitations, Billerbeck, IV, p. 426-429.

surprenant c'est que les LXX appliquent l'expression à Dieu comme le fera plus tard Philon. Sirach non plus n'a su se dérober entièrement à cet „esprit du siècle”.

Si nous comparons à ces auteurs les textes des rabbins il faut constater que chez eux

a) l'expression ne peut pas être considérée comme une règle fixe, puisqu'on y attache des significations contradictoires;

b) l'expression est en rapport avec des commandements concrets, et dépend du Deut.;

c) le blasphème qui peut être la suite d'une omission ou d'une addition ne consistait pas dans la violation de l'essence des choses ou de Dieu, mais dans les énonciations très concrètes au sujet de Dieu (voir p. 21-22); ¹¹⁹

d) l'expression paraît s'accorder quelquefois avec la conception grecque du mot ce qui en soi n'a rien d'étonnant, Liebermann ayant montré comment surtout dans les locutions l'influence grecque se manifeste de toutes sortes de façons dans les écrits rabbiniques du deuxième, troisième et quatrième siècle.¹²⁰

Un aperçu des écrits non-chrétiens nous apprend donc:

a) La règle qu'on trouve chez les auteurs chrétiens du 2^{me} siècle n'a pas besoin de l'Apocalypse xxii 18-19. Il est même très probable qu'il n'en est pas ainsi, attendu que dans le monde grec l'union est toujours προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφελεῖν sous la même forme sobre que chez Dionyse, Polycrate, Irénée etc. et jamais ἐπιθεῖναι. On rencontre la règle depuis longtemps avant l'Apocalypse.

b) Il est très bien possible, comme paraît le prouver la présence de la même règle en Egypte (p. 23) que ce soit une maxime orientale; il est plus probable qu'on a affaire ici à une manière de formuler, née spontanément chez toutes sortes de peuples pour exprimer le changement ou — pris dans un sens négatif — l'inviolabilité, non pas dans les formes abstraites, mais dans les formes concrètes où le changement s'accomplit. Chez Israël on l'appliquait au commandement, la parole de la révélation par excellence. Chez les Grecs l'application devenait beaucoup plus large, plus philosophique; elle n'exprimait pas la transgression du commandement, mais la violation de „l'essence” des choses, bien que le rapport avec le monde divin se soit pas rompu (voir Artémidore, cf. συνθῆκαι).

¹¹⁹ Par ces changements les mots pouvaient devenir contraires au seul „dogme” du Judaïsme, à savoir l'unité de l'Eternel (Deut. vi 4).

¹²⁰ S. Liebermann, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, New York 1942, passim.

c) Dans le judaïsme hellénistique les pensées grecques pénétrèrent dans le monde juif. Un point de contact se trouve, comme le prouve Philon, dans le Deut. iv 2, xii 32, mais le même auteur montre aussi que la pensée grecque domine. On ne parle plus du fait qu'on ne peut rien ôter des commandements de Dieu ni y ajouter, c.-à-d. qu'on ne doit faire ni plus ni moins,¹²¹ mais on emploie l'expression dans le sens général de: être parfait, rester intact. Quiconque enfreint cette loi, viole l'essence. Chez Ps. Aristéas, Josèphe et Philon on l'a appliquée à l'Écriture Sainte tout aussi bien qu'à la traduction et à la discussion de l'Ancien Testament. Le lecteur grec pouvait être certain que ce livre était absolument sûr et parfait comme Dieu lui-même. Celui qui y apporte des changements en ôtant ou en ajoutant, porte la main sur l'œuvre de Dieu et sur l'essence de cette œuvre. Ce fut un acte d'audace (p. 139 et 151) qui évidemment attira la malédiction sur l'auteur.¹²² Pour un Grec tout cela était parfaitement évident et péremptoire.

Après cette discussion sur les antécédents il nous reste à classer les matériaux dans le domaine chrétien avant de terminer cet essai.

Au sujet de l'Apoc. xxii 18-19 plusieurs questions s'élevaient (p. 132-134). Or, nous avons constaté que si l'on rencontrait des changements dans la règle *μὴ προσθεῖναι μὴ ἀφελεῖν*, c'était toujours dans la deuxième partie; *προστίθῃμι* se traduit toujours par „ajouter”. Voilà pourquoi il est hors de doute que Jean tout en visant la règle l'applique en rapport avec l'esprit de son livre. Ainsi l'auteur — dont le grec montre par-ci, par-là, des erreurs ¹²³ — s'est servi plus ou moins à tort du mot *ἐπιτίθῃμι* parce qu'il voulait adopter ce verbe au jeu de mots de la suite, comme l'avait déjà soupçonné Pricaeus.¹²⁴

L'emploi dans Barnabé et la Didaché remonte directement au Deutéronome.

L'acceptation dans la 2^{me} moitié du 2^{me} siècle se marie bien avec l'usage de la langue des Juifs hellénisants; cet usage la rend même plus claire: on trouvait là la violation de l'essence; le mal qui y était inhérent; un texte auquel on n'avait rien ajouté et dont on n'avait rien ôté y avait un caractère divin, immobile, digne de foi. Il était parfaitement clair aux lecteurs grecs à quel jeu ignomi-

¹²¹ Le rabbinisme le savait très bien; on y avait compté 613 commandements et défenses.

¹²² Comme on l'a démontré, la naissance du blasphème avait chez les Juifs une cause toute différente et très concrète.

¹²³ Voir R. H. Charles, *Revelation*, vol. I, p. CXVII-CLIX.

¹²⁴ Ci-dessus p. 145 nt. 98.

nieux se livraient les hérétiques, mais aussi quelle perfection divine émanait des Ecritures et de la tradition, fondée sur elles. Il est possible que cette manière de formuler fût propagée sous l'influence de l'Apoc. xxii 18-19; cependant il est impossible de l'en déduire.

On ne saurait pas non plus en conclure que dès cette époque on a reconnu l'Apocalypse comme un livre canonique.¹²⁵ Le fait qu'Irénée rattache la règle à la Gematria (p. 144) ne prouve rien contre l'origine grecque, ceci étant un moyen très connu dans le monde grec (depuis les Pythagoriciens). Est-ce qu'au deuxième siècle ce terme serait caractéristique pour l'Asie Mineure (voir p. 131)?

Finalement la question se pose de savoir ce que cela signifie en rapport avec la διαθήκη dans le livre de l'Anti-montaniste (Eus. H.E. V, 16, 3). Nous avons déjà constaté que chez les juifs hellénisants on appliquait la règle à l'Ecriture pour attester ainsi que ce recueil a été transmis à la postérité sans changements (p. 136). En outre il faut se rappeler que προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφελεῖν, se rencontre chez les συνθήκαι = les traités entre deux états (p. 148). Or ce qui est surprenant c'est que dans les traductions postérieures de l'Ancien Testament en grec le mot alliance (ברית) ne se traduit plus par διαθήκη, qui indique le testament d'un légateur mais par συνθήκη = traité.¹²⁶ Les deux notions s'assimilent, bien que LXX aient presque exclusivement διαθήκη. Il n'y a donc rien d'étonnant qu'on fasse valoir les règles formelles d'un traité pour l'„Alliance”.

Après tout cela il me paraît incontestable qu'il faut penser chez l'Anti-montaniste à une διαθήκη écrite et fixe, à un recueil d'écrits. Son écrit n'avait pas pour but d'ajouter quoi que ce soit à la „parole” de la διαθήκη qui fut autre que les traités grecs, c.-à-d. l'alliance de l'Evangile et qui par ce caractère se distinguait en même temps de l'Alliance de la Loi (voir p. 127). Car la règle que les Juifs hellénisants appliquaient à l'Ancien Testament et qui dans les oreilles grecques rendait un son si familier (comme expression du caractère divin et sacré) s'appliquait aussi à cette „Alliance de l'Evangile”.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ Harnack, *Entstehung*, p. 69, nt. 1: „Wohl nicht unabhängig von Apok. 22, 18 f.”.

¹²⁶ E. Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, Leipzig 1913, notamment p. 104-107. — J. Behm, Διαθήκη, dans: G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, Stuttgart 1935, vol. II, p. 127 et 131.

¹²⁷ La construction du grec demande cette traduction et pas celle de Meyboom et Franes dans leurs traductions de l'Histoire ecclésiastique d'Eusèbe: „à l'évangile de l'alliance”.

A la fin de cet article l'auteur voudrait bien prier les lecteurs de lui communiquer leurs observations „pour que rien ne nous échappe”; lui-même doit répéter avec une légère variante la parole de Cébès οὐδὲν ἔγωγε ἐν τῷ παρόντι . . . οὔτε ἀφελεῖν οὔτε προσθεῖναι δύναμαι. (voir p. 146).

Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη—A PROBLEM IN THE EARLY HISTORY
OF THE CANON *

During the severe persecution which raged against the churches of Lyons and Vienna in 177 A.D. reports about the outbursts of the "New Prophecy" or Montanism in Asia Minor reached Gaul. Notwithstanding their own dangerous situation concern for the welfare of the universal church was strongly felt by the confessors in the Rhône valley. From their prison they sent several letters both to Asia Minor and to the bishop of Rome, Eleutheros, negotiating for the peace of the churches.¹ The epistle to Rome was entrusted to a presbyter, who later was to win world-fame, Irenaeus. He was introduced to Eleutheros in a special letter of recommendation, "rendering", as Eusebius says, "abundant testimony to the man". His fellow christians describe Irenaeus as "zealous for the covenant of Christ" ζηλωτὴν ὄντα τῆς διαθήκης Χριστοῦ² and an excellent presbyter.

The latter qualification is what one might expect, but the former is most striking and, as far as I am aware, unique in Christian literature. Ζηλωτής in a favourable sense³ is found several times in the N.T. e.g. Acts xxi 20, Jews of those who have believed are styled "all zealous for the law"; Gal. i 14, where Paul speaking of himself says: "so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers"; Titus ii 14, "a people of his own who are zealous for good deeds". The word qualifies a person as completely devoted, soul and body, to and working for a certain cause which is of the highest importance. But a combination of this substantive with διαθήκη Χριστοῦ is not found anywhere: the nearest parallel is Acts xxi 20 (cf. 2. Macc. iv 2): zealots for the law. It appears from the context that it marks Irenaeus as a man of very high distinction, but it is rather difficult to understand what great value was attached to this διαθήκη Χριστοῦ. It is not merely said that he was zealous for God's

* Appeared in *Studia Patristica*, I Berlin, 1961 p. 212-227.

¹ In: Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* V 3, 4.

² Eusebius, I. I. V 4, 2.

³ Cf. A. Stumpff, in: G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.* II, Stuttgart 1935, 879 ff.; W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des N.T. und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, 5. Edition. Berlin 1958, 668 f., who cites also examples from non-Christian sources.

or Christ's sake, for the benefit of the church, though that seems more or less implied; it is expressed in this way "for the covenant of Christ".

Two more observations may be made in this connection which once more bring to light the necessity of a close scrutiny of the term:

1. The singularity of the combination makes us think that it was specially coined for that man and that occasion; in connection with the man it will presently be seen that this description was very apt.

2. Irenaeus did not travel to Rome for pleasure, but for business, the point at issue being something that concerned Gaul, Rome and Asia Minor. If he is highly praised for his zeal for the "covenant of Christ" and recommended for that reason, this could only be suitably and sensibly done on condition that this quality was generally accepted, in other words that it was generally accepted as a good of the highest value and that it had some relation to the subject-matter or to what is called by Eusebius "the peace of the church".

It seems to me that this fact, the general acceptance of διαθήκη Χριστοῦ at that time (c. 175 A.D.), is highly significant, when we ask for the meaning of καινή διαθήκη in its application to that collection of early Christian books which we usually call "the New Testament" and which under that name influenced the church and the world in an absolutely unique manner. It cannot be denied that the terms "Old" and "New" Testament respectively or the pre-Christian and christian part of the Bible have become neutralized. The word "testament" in this connection has become a hollow shell to most Christians which is used without any meaning. This happened for western christendom, when *Testamentum* was adopted as a translation for διαθήκη. In itself this was quite correct from the point of view of ordinary Greek usage, but it missed the particular connotations of biblical Greek.⁴

But even in the sphere of the Greek-speaking church the terms soon lost any meaning. As may be seen in Origen already ἡ παλαιὰ and ἡ καινή διαθήκη were just designations for the two parts of the Bible,⁵ but did not play any specific role in his theology. And as the title of a book it is somewhat peculiar. At least Origen felt so.

⁴ See the well-known monographs of J. Behm, *Der Begriff Διαθήκη im Neuen Testament*, Leipzig 1912 and E. Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, Leipzig 1913.

⁵ Cf. Origenes, *In Joannem* V 8 . . . συμφωνίας δογμάτων κοινῶν τῇ καλουμένῃ παλαιᾷ πρὸς τὴν ὀνομαζομένην καινὴν διαθήκην.

This it shares with more titles, but it is none the less arresting.

In the history of the formation of the canon much attention is always paid to the question, how these various books were collected into one volume. The various stages of this process varying from one book or groups of books to another is most interesting. Little attention however is given to that other question, why these books were assembled under the title of a διαθήκη. This problem is the more fascinating since this name had such a success, that it remains the standard title in the church ever since. Various books on the history of the canon do not discuss this problem at all. It might seem as though there is no difficulty here, but it may be that we are too accustomed to the term, that we are deaf and blind for the real question. Von Harnack once made the remark—also in connection with the history of the canon—that there are some questions left, “weil das, woran man sich gewöhnt hat, als das selbstverständliche erscheint und daher die Untersuchung nicht herausfordert”.⁶

In a few sentences of his recent *Early Christian Doctrines*,⁷ Kelly says that Irenaeus was the first to apply the term N.T. to sacred scriptures and that after his times “the description of them as the ‘New Testament’ (a title harking back to St. Paul’s designation⁸ of the Jewish scriptures as ‘the old covenant’) came into vogue”. But this statement leaves unexplained what is meant by this term and why it was Irenaeus—if he it was—who first made this successful move. On closer inspection it turns out that the situation is far more complicated. It is usual to refer back to Paul’s words in 2. Cor. iii 14, but it is unexplained why amidst all the various designations for the N.T. in early Christian literature we do not find this one and that it happens to make its entrance in the Christian vocabulary together with the N.T.

Let us now turn to the answer given by the two unsurpassed masters in this field: Theodor Zahn and Adolf von Harnack. The former wrote in his *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*⁹ that in the Bible διαθήκη is the covenant, “die von Gott der Gemeinde gegebene Ordnung ihres Verhältnisses zu ihm”, and the καινὴ διαθήκη gives a certain modification: “eine der Endzeit vorbehaltene

⁶ A. Harnack, “Einige Bemerkungen zur Geschichte der Entstehung des Neuer Testaments”. in *Reden und Aufsätze* II, 2 Ed. Giessen 1906, 239.

⁷ J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London 1958, 56.

⁸ Kelly refers here to 2. Cor. iii 14.

⁹ Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* I, Erlangen 1888, 103 ff.

durch Christus gestiftete Neuordnung dieses Verhältnisses"; St. Paul applied the word to a written document, the Tora, not the whole O.T.; the fact that Melito of Sardes made a list of "the books of the *παλαιὰ διαθήκη*" ¹⁰ implies the existence of a similar list for the N.T., but neither Melito nor Irenaeus speak of a book. In his *Grundriß* ¹¹ he summarizes his position as follows: "die Übertragung des Begriffes *διαθήκη* von der göttlichen Offenbarung und Stiftung auf das Buch oder die Bücher . . . ist doch erst ziemlich spät in der Kirche üblich geworden, zumal in bezug auf das N.T.". It is not yet in Irenaeus, uncertain in the anonymous Anti-Montanist, but certainly in Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian. Here we underline the fact, that Zahn gives a very formal definition of *διαθήκη* which is as will appear later not in accordance with the facts; in the Bible itself all stress is laid upon the contrasts of the Covenant. Secondly it may be remarked that Zahn expresses his astonishment at the late introduction, but he does not explain the transition to which he draws attention. Von Harnack ¹² sees a special motive for the coming into being of the N.T., besides the collection of the words of Jesus and the scheme: prophecy—fulfilment: the idea of the new covenant which is introduced by Paul: "Daß das, was Christus gebracht hat, unbeschadet der Anknüpfung an das A.T., etwas 'Neues' ist und einen 'neuen Bund' darstellt, war die Überzeugung der paulinischen Christen . . . Die Konzeption des 'Neuen Bundes' aber mußte das Bedürfnis nach etwas Urkundlichem nahelegen". But that has not happened immediately, because one projected the contrast "Law and Gospel" back into the O.T. and therefore did not need a written document. Later one wanted to have besides the accepted O.T. sources which demonstrated the pre-eminent importance of this new covenant and in the course of time one looked back upon the period of Jesus and the apostles as the classical epoch. It was according to von Harnack, the Montanist crisis which brought the definite change. "Erst dieser Position gegenüber haben die Kirchenführer die Idee eines in der Erscheinung Christi und dem Werk der Apostel abgeschlossenen Bundes durchdacht und zu Ende geführt, um dann auf ihrem Grunde

¹⁰ In: Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* IV 26, 14.

¹¹ Th. Zahn, *Grundriß der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 2. Auflage. Leipzig 1904, 11.

¹² A. von Harnack, *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen der neuen Schöpfung*, Leipzig 1914, 10 ff.

konsequent alles an Schreibern abzulehnen, was nicht zu dieser alten Epoche gehörte." The Spirit was closed into a book. It seems to me that the starting point of the great German scholar was not quite right. In his opinion the new fact Christ brought was something apart from the O.T. and that this was expressed by the pauline Christians by the word: new covenant; the relation with the O.T. was just an afterthought. The facts are that the idea of a "new covenant" cannot be separated from the O.T., because it originated there and is completely unintelligible without the O.T. Was it true that this idea of a *BUND* itself suggested a document? A somewhat closer analysis of the idea is not superfluous.

The problem before us is this: in the canon of the second century we find that certain Christian books, the gospels and letters of apostles have a certain authority, but it is only by the end of that century that they are all comprised under the heading: καινὴ διαθήκη (we keep this Greek term, because for clarity's sake it is better to have it untranslated). This term got such a firm footing in the church that it soon became the designation of a book without further ado and it was so well established that Tertullian who preferred himself a rather different term had to yield to its Latin translation *testamentum*.¹³ It is a matter of course that various other designations like "the Scriptures", "the Word" etc. remained in use, as is the case up till the present time, but as a title ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη was and is dominant. What connotations had it for those who first employed it?

In answering this question by turning to the sources we remind ourselves of the following facts:

1. our source-material is very scarce. In comparison with what is left of other religions in the Roman empire it may seem extraordinarily rich, if we look at the wide expansion of Christianity and realize that we are dealing with a period of 150 years—which in antiquity were as long as they are now—, if we read the long lists of lost writings mentioned by Eusebius and others, we have the feeling of walking among ruins and that reconstruction is highly hypothetical.

2. what is left, was written for certain occasions and gives a one-sided picture; it brings to light what the author wanted to say at that moment, but that does not mean that he told everything he

¹³ Tertullianus, *Adversus Marcionem* IV 1 . . . *alterum alterius instrumenti, vel, quod magis usui est dicere, testamenti* . . .

knew. It may be that certain ideas are missing in a given book though they were current in that time as it happens now.

3. all patristic work, especially that dealing with the pre-constantine period must take into account comparative religion. Ideas to which we have got accustomed by a long Christian tradition, become strange if viewed with the eyes of men in antiquity, and on the other hand only comparing words and contexts with contemporary usage brings out not only dependence but also and foremost new contents. What Kittels *Wörterbuch* does for the N.T. vocabulary ought to be continued as is done in the *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, but it has not had its effect upon the history of early Christian theology. The full brightness and impact of Christian ideas only shines out in its ancient surroundings and not in the dim light of a quasi-eternity.

The first unequivocal connection between ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη and Christian literature is found in a refutation of Montanism by an anonymous author, writing in 192/193.¹⁴ In his introduction he says that he was urged to compose a treatise (τινὰ λόγον) against this heresy but that he shrank back from this task not for lack of arguments but "from fear and extreme caution, lest perchance I might seem to some to be adding a new article or clause to the word of the New Covenant of the Gospel, to which no one who has purposed to live according to the Gospel¹⁵ may add, from which no one may take away"; he has overcome his fear by seeing how badly in need the church stood of something to stop this "new prophecy". The exact interpretation of this text is surrounded with difficulties. On the one hand it seems as though he speaks about a closed number of sacred books, but this list is not yet water-tight, because there could be a chance that his own book would be reckoned with it. Had a fixed canon existed already by that time, later well-known difficulties about certain books would have been impossible. He does not speak about "books of the New Covenant of the Gospel", but in the singular ὁ λόγος. This must be left unchanged, unspoil, preserve its divine character.¹⁶ The rule "not to add to nor

¹⁴ In: Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* V 16, 3.

¹⁵ Lawlor-Oulton in their translation add here: "simple" which is not in the Greek; αὐτό = itself.

¹⁶ See W. C. van Unnik, "De la règle ΜΗΤΕ ΠΡΟΣΘΕΙΝΑΙ ΜΗΤΕ ΑΦΕΛΕΙΝ dans l'histoire du Canon", in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 3, 1949, 1 ff., (in this volume p. 123-156) it is not a quotation from Apoc. xxii 18 f., but a well-known rule.

to take away from" was used in covenants and ἐπιδιατάσσεσθαι means: to add a clause to a contract (Gal. iii 15). The λόγος is the total content as in ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας.¹⁷ The author is wanting to avoid implying that the character of the message given in the καινὴ διαθήκη τοῦ εὐαγγελίου might be changed in any way. I wonder whether he is thinking so much of a certain collection of books—in this respect I must make a "retractation" of my opinion expressed ten years ago¹⁸—; it seems that he has in mind the total message. From another passage in his writing it is clear that he uses διαθήκη in a wider sense at the time under the Old and New Covenant, because to the great astonishment of Eusebius, who took the words in their later fossilized manner, he included among the prophets κατὰ τὴν καινὴν also some names of Christians outside the N.T.¹⁹ It is the Christian era marked as a καινὴ διαθήκη stamped by the Gospel.²⁰ But he does not explicitly specify the contents of this λόγος; at any rate it contains the terms of this "New Covenant".

Another well-known text in this connection is the proemium of Melito of Sardes to his book of *Eklogai* (about 170).²¹ At the request of a certain Onesimus he gives "extracts from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and our faith as a whole". This last book thus contained a collection of testimonia, later collections of which have survived.²² They were used especially in controversy against the Jews to prove that Jesus was the Messiah and that in the church the prophecies were fulfilled. It is remarkable that Melito uses a well-known Jewish name for the O.T.:²³ Law and Prophets. Besides that his correspondent desired "to learn the exact truth as to the ancient books what is their number and what their order". To make sure about this point he went to Palestine²⁴ "and

¹⁷ Cf. G. Kittel, in: G. Kittel, IV, Stuttgart 1942, 115 ff.; W. Bauer, 943.

¹⁸ W. C. van Unnik, *l.c.* 36, in this volume p. 155.

¹⁹ In: Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* V 17, 2-3.

²⁰ Not as a book, but as the message of salvation.

²¹ In: Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* IV 26, 13-14.

²² R. Harris, *Testimonies*, Cambridge 1916-1920.

²³ H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch* I, München 1922, 240.

²⁴ Melito, in: Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* IV, 26, 13-14: ἐπειδὴ πολλάκις ἡξίωσας, σπουδῇ τῇ πρὸς τὸν λόγον χρώμενος, γενέσθαι σοι ἐκλογὰς ἐκ τε τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ μαθεῖν τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν βιβλίων ἐβουλήθης ἀκριβείαν πόσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν καὶ ὅποια τὴν ἀξίαν εἶεν, ἐσπούδασα τὸ τοιοῦτο πράξαι, ἐπιστάμενός σου τὸ σπουδαῖον περὶ τὴν πίστιν καὶ φιλομαθὲς περὶ τὸν λόγον ὅτι τε μάλιστα πάντων πόθω τῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ταῦτα προκρίνεις, περὶ τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας ἀγωνιζόμενος. ἀνελθὼν οὖν εἰς

having exactly learnt which are *the books of the Old Covenant* I send thee the list", followed by the names. It has often been suggested that where Melito knew of a fixed list of O.T. books, he must also have possessed one of the N.T. I do not think that the evidence allows such an extrapolation. It is somewhat surprising to read that the bishop of Sardes had to travel to the East "to the place where these things were proclaimed and done", before he could answer the question. And this question itself was not one of idle curiosity, but was linked up with the desire for "testimonies". There is only one reason which explains all this. Between the Jews and the Christians there existed a difference about the O.T. text, as may be seen from various passages in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*.²⁵ If Onesimus was taking proof texts from books not recognized by the Jews his whole argument would fail. Therefore the list of Melito is the Jewish one: these are the books of the *παλαιὰ διαθήκη*. But there is no evidence whatever that a comparable need existed for books of the *καινὴ διαθήκη*. The need Melito felt was not conditioned by ecclesiastical, but controversial reasons. He does not say: this is the O.T., but: these are the *books* of the *παλαιὰ διαθήκη*.

Though Irenaeus uses the word *διαθήκη* and the combination *καινὴ διαθήκη* and *παλαιὰ διαθήκη* many times, it is highly uncertain whether he had a book in mind. Zahn, von Harnack and Hoh, who made a special study of the subject,²⁶ denied it; Mrs. Flesseman and Kelly however think he did.²⁷ But be that as it may, it is perfectly clear that this idea is not prominent and that as we shall see presently he has always other aspects in mind. Although Irenaeus has the authoritative scriptures of the evangelists and apostles, although he has a fixed *regula veritatis*, his conception of *διαθήκη* has a different structure from that of a biblical canon.

Was it Paul, who first suggested the idea? This is highly improbable. To be sure he speaks in 2. Cor. iii 14 about the "reading of the Old Testament" (*ἀνάγνωσις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης*), but this expression is changed in the next verse to Moses, clearly an ab-

τὴν ἀνατολὴν καὶ ἕως τοῦ τόπου γενόμενος ἔνθα ἐκηρύχθη καὶ ἐπράχθη, καὶ ἀκριβῶς μαθὼν τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία, ὑποτάξας ἐπεμψά σοι.

²⁵ Justinus, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 72 and 73 with the notes of A. Lukyn Williams, London 1930.

²⁶ Zahn and von Harnack, *l. c.*; J. Hoh, *Die Lehre des Hl. Irenaeus über das Neue Testament*, Münster i. W. 1919, 1.

²⁷ J. N. D. Kelly, *l. c.*, 56; E. Flesseman-van Leer, *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*, Assen 1953, 132.

abbreviation for "the books of . . .". So he means the Tora and not the whole O.T. From the context it is clear that he could speak about "reading of the παλαιὰ διαθήκη", but not of its counterpart a καινὴ διαθήκη, because the former was in letters, and the latter in the Spirit (vs. 7). Paul's thought in 2. Cor. iii took its start from the idea of the New Covenant, predicted by the prophets; this surpasses by far the covenant of Moses, as he explains by various contrasts and the story of Exod. xxxiv. From this train of thought immediately springs the word "old", otherwise he could not express his opinion. But however many quotations are given in the post-apostolic writings, never is there any influence of this passage of Paul's. It is remarkable that Irenaeus gives one reference to 2. Cor. iii among the hundreds of citations, but that is not to vs. 14, but to vs. 3. The distinction Paul made between Old and New Covenant proved, as will be seen, very fruitful, but was not the incentive to the distribution of the two names to two parts of one Bible.

Was the idea of styling the holy Scripture as a διαθήκη a purely Christian one or was it taken over? In the Hellenistic world we do not find any trace of such an usage. The Jews had various designations for the holy Scripture, but βιβλος διαθήκης is not there.²⁸ If that expression is found as in Sirach xxiv 23²⁹ and 1. Macc. i 57, it stands parallel to the Law, but is not extended to the Prophets and the Writings, (see also 2. Kings xxiii 2. 21; 2. Chron. xxxiv 30). In Exod. xxiv 7 it is part of the Pentateuch in which the rules Israel had to obey as members of the covenant are laid down. Blau³⁰ has argued that it once was customary among the Jews, but that it was dropped because of rivalry against the Christians. His argument falls to the ground, if one sees that the term is completely missing in Jewish tradition, but that Blau argues from Paul's usage in 2. Cor. iii 14. Therefore we must conclude that it is a specific Christian terminology though Blau was completely right in maintaining that "dieselbe dem Hauptbegriffe nach innerhalb des Judentums entstanden" (ist).

From the careful linguistic analyses of Behm and Lohmeyer,³¹ it has become perfectly clear that διαθήκη in the N.T. has not³²

²⁸ Strack-Billerbeck, IV, München 1928, 415 ff.

²⁹ This interpretation is rejected by N. Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus*, Münster i. W. 1913, 202.

³⁰ L. Blau, *Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*, Budapest 1894, 19 f.

³¹ See note 4.

³² With the exception of Gal. iii 15 and Hebr. ix 16 f.

the usual Greek sense of "testament", but is derived from the LXX translation of בְּרִית = covenant. The early christian writers Barnabas and Justin continue that line. This somewhat unusual meaning of διαθήκη was taken instead of συνθήκη because the parties of this alliance were not of equal value, it being a covenant between God Almighty and unimportant Israel. God has chosen Israel out of all nations: "I will be your God and you shall be My people". They must be holy and receive God's promises. The Law regulates the conduct of Israel. Therefore is this law a joy (Ps. xix and cxix). At the same time Israel is warned that disobedience will cause all sorts of evil, the last of which is being scattered among the Gentiles, (see e.g. Lev. xxvi). The Lord however is faithful. If Israel repents He will restore them and bring them back to the Holy Land. Many prophecies speak about this restoration; in one place it is expressly called: the New Covenant (Jer. xxxi 31). Is this just a new regulation of God's relation with Israel, as Zahn expressed it?

Before answering this question we must make two observations:

1. a covenant-relation between God and men is an absolutely unique fact in history of religions; this was not only the case in the O.T. times, as Vriezen pointed out³³, but also in the Hellenistic-Roman world. This holds good for the New Covenant a fortiori. If something like a καινή διαθήκη was preached it could only be understood on its O.T. basis, but was something unheard of before by the "Gentiles".

2. it is striking that in Rabbinic literature this category of the "New Covenant" is hardly mentioned.³⁴ In general a tendency can be observed to speak more about the Law than about the Covenant. In this respect it is revealing to see that in Büchlert's important *Studies in Sin and Atonement* the covenant-conception is dealt with in a chapter called *Obedience to the Law*. Also in that community which is sometimes called that of "the covenanters" of Damascus or of Qumran the renewal consists in intensification of the Law. It is not sufficient simply to mention the prophecy and expectation of the New Covenant; it is necessary to see what was contained in it. The classical text is Jer. xxxi 31 ff.; the days will come that Jahwe will make a New Covenant, not as that of the Sinai, which was broken by the Jews; "I will put My Law within them and I will

³³ Th. C. Vriezen, *Hoofddlijnen der theologie van het Oude Testament*, 2nd edition, Wageningen 1954, 150 f.

³⁴ Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, III, München 1926, 704.

write it upon their hearts and I will be their God and they shall be My people . . . they shall all know Me . . . for I will forgive their iniquity and I will remember their sin no more". The real unity aimed at by the Sinai-covenant, but broken by the disobedience of Israel will be restored. Once again sounds the word: "I will be their God and they shall be My people". Similar thoughts are expressed in Ezech. xxxvi 24 ff.: "I will sprinkle clear water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleanness and from all your idols. I will cleanse you. A new heart I will give you and a new spirit I will put within you . . . I will put My Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in My statutes and be careful to observe My ordinances . . . you shall be My people and I will be your God". With this idea of the new spirit was connected the prophecy of Joel: "and it shall come to pass in the last days that I will pour out My Spirit on all flesh". Other features in similar passages are the circumcision of the heart and not of the flesh; Israel will be children of the living God; God will walk in their midst. It will be an eternal covenant. It will be a total renewal: all sins will be forgiven; man will know his God and live with Him in a completely new relation.

These hopes were not confined to the O.T. but repeated with different variations in later Jewish literature ³⁵ which shows that they were fully alive. They were cherished by hearts longing for full communion with God. In the epistles of Paul, 1 Peter and Acts these notions connected with the "New Covenant" recur, either in direct quotations or in references. But now it is no more *hope*, since the New Covenant has come. Since Jesus shed His blood of which He had said at the Last Supper: "this cup is the new covenant in My blood" to which some traditions add: "for the remission of sins", it is a joyful reality. Men and women turned to the Lord revealed in the Messiah Jesus. They have experienced the saving and the renewing power of the Spirit "by which we cry 'Abba-Father' ". Lives were changed from the service of the idols to the living God. Gentiles were accepting Jesus as the Messiah, who was set as a light for the Gentiles. They were adopted as children of God and incorporated in the ἐκκλησία. A hard thing was the stubbornness of a great many Jews, who rejected the Messiah, but in this case too the prophecies had predicted what became manifest to the Christians. ³⁶

³⁵ A. von Stromberg, *Studien zur Theorie und Praxis der Taufe in der christlichen Kirche der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte*, Berlin 1913, 63 ff.

³⁶ See my article: "*La conception paulinienne de la nouvelle alliance*", in:

The first covenant with Abraham without all the outward devotion which God did not need, was renewed. It was a covenant with promises for the ἔθνη as well. One remarkable feature seems to be missing here: the gathering of the people of God. In many fathers this is expected for the future and lies at the root of thoughts about the Millennium, though in Paul it is more connected with the heavenly Jerusalem and on ἐπισυναγωγή at the parousia.

We who have 19 centuries of Christianity behind us and are used to read things more or less from a christological point of view, hardly realize that these patent facts were not theory for the Christians, but the lifeblood of happiness and strength. The texts from the O.T. were collected not for a pastime, but for their joy that the Lord had realized His promises, to defend their faith against attacks that it was not make-believe. The same group of O.T. texts is always, with slight variations, recurring,³⁷ though not in the form that one writer simply copies his predecessor, but as new variations to the same theme.

This is also the case with Irenaeus, the man who was recommended by his brethren as "zealous for the covenant of Christ". Especially in the fourth book of his *Adversus haereses* and at the end of the *Epideixis* (86 ff.) he deals with this theme at great length and very fully. Out of a long array of relevant passages I can only quote one or two, since time does not allow more. Most significant are I think the following (*Adversus haereses* IV 33, 14): "Those of the prophets who declare that God would make a new covenant with men, not such as that which He made with the Fathers at Mount Horeb, and would give to men a new heart and a new spirit, and again: and remember ye not the things of old; behold I make new things which shall now arise, and ye shall know it; and I will make a way in the desert, and rivers in a dry land, to give drink to My chosen people, whom I have acquired; that they may show My praise—plainly announced that liberty which distinguishes the new covenant, and the new wine which is put into new bottles that is the faith which is in Christ, by which He has proclaimed the way of righteousness spring up in the desert, and the streams of the Holy Spirit in a dry land, to give water to the elect people of God, whom

"*Littérature et théologie pauliniennes*" (*Recherches bibliques* V), Bruges 1960, 109-126, *Sparsa Collecta* I, p. 174-193.

³⁷ See J. L. Koole, *De overname van het Oude Testament door de Christelijke Kerk*, Hilversum 1938.

He has acquired";—*Adversus haereses* III 17, 1 ff.: "the apostles did not declare that Christ descended upon Jesus as the Gnostics taught, but that the Spirit came of which Isaiah had spoken (Is. xi 2; lxi 1), of which Jesus spoke in Matth. x 20, the Spirit of regeneration (Matth. xxviii 19) which was promised for the last times (Joel iii) to rest with human beings, and to dwell in the workmanship of God, working the will of the Father in them and renewing them from their old habits into the newness of Christ". David prayed in Ps. li 14 for that Spirit "who also, as Luke says, descended at the day of Pentecost upon the disciples after the Lord's ascension, having power to admit all nations to the entrance of life and to the opening of the New Covenant . . . The Lord receiving this as a gift from His Father, does Himself also confer it upon those who are partakers of Himself, sending the Holy Spirit upon all the earth". This Spirit of the remission of sins is the lifegiving seed, which produces living sons to the living God (*Adversus haereses* IV 31, 2). Study of the various διαθήκαι and their specific character is mentioned by Irenaeus as one of the special themes that may be studied in connection with the Creed which is everywhere the same in the whole world (I 10, 3). Though he once speaks about four covenants his real interest is in two, that with Israel and the new one. The New Covenant was predicted by the prophets and is opened after Jesus' atoning death by the outpouring of the Spirit; it comprises both Jews and Gentiles. God asks obedience and no sacrifices. The old law of servitude was given because Israel followed idols (Exod. xxxii), the new one is a restoration of the great commandments: love towards God and the neighbour. It brings adoption and freedom. It is the law which the patriarchs already had written in their hearts, which now is open to all in these last times. Irenaeus knows about the conversion wrought by the Spirit. To the great surprise of Eusebius he tells about the miraculous forces of the Spirit in his own time. It is a living reality to him.

In reading the passages where Irenaeus deals with the New Covenant one notices that he is using general notions with a typically polemical application viz. to show to the Gnostics who rejected the O.T. that it is the same God in both. It is a fundamental part of his theology as may be seen from the *Epideixis* where he gives the positive exposition. This combined with the fact that he is called "zealous for the covenant of Christ" makes it the more remarkable that so little attention is given to this

theme in the descriptions of Irenaeus' theology. It is too important to be dealt with in a chapter on the relation between the two parts of the Bible by way of introduction as is generally done. This marked feature of his theology comes the more to the fore if one sees that he does not use the epistle to the Hebrews. Its contents are far richer than the simple contrast between slavery and freedom. Seeberg has charged Irenaeus with introducing legalism and rationalism.³⁸ This is an unjust and a mistaken interpretation. Irenaeus moves in biblical lines; over and again motives from the Bible are heard. He is not parroting St. Paul, but follows independently the track beaten by the apostle. It is remarkable that *διαθήκη* has here always the biblical notion of "covenant" and never any relation to "testament". All stress is laid upon the new situation which came about since Pentecost; since then we live "*in novissimis temporibus*",³⁹ the new era has come because the Spirit is manifestly at work. There is no shadow of the idea that he saw a difference between his time and that of the apostles, as though the latter were the "classical" epoch. He lives in one continued time—the "last times" which precede the resurrection—the time of the Spirit.

In one place Irenaeus gives a very strange "exegesis" of the story of Lot and his daughters which is applied to the two churches of Jews and Gentiles. He says it was derived from one of the presbyters.⁴⁰ This gives us an interesting insight into the background of his thought. It originated in discussion with the Jews! Even more obvious is his relation to parallel ideas in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*. The theme e.g. of Israel's being punished by the ceremonial legislation because of the idolatry of the Golden Calf is common to both, but has a different application and was, as may be seen from elsewhere⁴¹ the stock-in-trade of the second century theology. Irenaeus is not repeating old things; he is not creating new theology. He is a representative of ideas generally accepted by many church-leaders of his time.

³⁸ R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 3rd ed. Leipzig-Erlangen 1920, I, 399 ff.

³⁹ An often-recurring theme in his works.

⁴⁰ Cf. J. Munck, "Presbyters and Disciples of the Lord in Papias", in: *Harvard Theological Review* 52, 1959, 223 ff.

⁴¹ W. C. van Unnik, "De beteekenis van de Mozaïsche Wet voor de Kerk van Christus volgens de Syrische Didascalie", in: *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 31, 1939, 89 ff., English translation in *Sparsa Collecta* III.

These were the notions connected with καινὴ διαθήκη in the second half of the second century. It was a wonderful reality, an experience of God who fulfilled His promises in a personalistic way: "I will be your God and you shall be My people". The use of the term was not a hollow shell but encompassed the full richness of the Christian faith.

In this climate were the Gospels and Apostolic writings first styled "books of the καινὴ διαθήκη". Those books which witnessed to that "New Covenant" were accepted, according to the rule: "we have learned from no others the plan of our salvation, than from those through whom the gospel has come down to us which they did at one time proclaim in public, and at a later period, by the will of God, handed down to us in the Scriptures to be the ground and pillar of our faith" (*Irenaeus, Adversus haereses* III 1, 1). These books witnessed to the mighty works of God which were still present by the activity of the Spirit.

This rich title was generally accepted. But soon afterwards it lost its dynamic weight and became nothing more than just a title. It may be that the Montanist crisis had something to do with it. But most certainly there were other reasons as well. In the West the translation *testamentum* and not *foedus* for διαθήκη had, as far as I can see, very serious consequences. In the Greek speaking world διαθήκη was soon misunderstood as "testament" and a change in outlook robbed it of its influence. Later other criteria were sought to express the special character of Scriptures. But that is another chapter, which lies outside the scope of our present investigation.

Our task has been fulfilled, if it has become clear what was the meaning of the term καινὴ διαθήκη, the heading under which the Christians by the end of the second century saw their holy scriptures.

Patristic studies are often like a walk through excavated ruins; we see the mutilated remnants of past glory. But by the Spirit of the New Covenant the ruins become stones in the temple of the living God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

CORPUS HELLENISTICUM

SECOND REPORT ON THE CORPUS HELLENISTICUM*

In the programme of this conference¹ the name of Professor D. Kurt Aland (Halle) and my own name are mentioned together for this item of this evening's meeting. But my colleague and friend has kindly left the honour of delivering this year's report to me. Unfortunately our collaborator Professor D. G. Delling of Halle has been unable to attend this meeting of our Society, so that I am going to speak on behalf of the two branches of our undertaking. But you need not fear that the word of St James iii 10 will be fulfilled in your ears: "Out of the same mouth cometh forth blessing and cursing". Though there is some distance between Halle and Utrecht, our collaboration has developed most successfully, first by correspondence and later by a visit which I paid to Halle in July of this year in connexion with the regular meeting of the Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte, one of the sponsoring bodies of the Corpus. During last week-end Professor Aland and I devoted many hours of discussion to this project. What will be said is the outcome of our deliberations and agreement.

This report is a sequel to that of Professor Aland, given last year at the Bangor meeting.² He sketched out plans, some of which have been carried out in the course of this year. As is well known, the existing Corpus was divided into two parts, a Judaeo-Hellenisticum and a Pagano-Hellenisticum. The former was still in its original place, Halle, the latter was in Uppsala, to which it had been brought by the late Professor Fridrichsen during the last war. It was agreed that Professor Delling should take over the work for the Jewish-Greek authors, while the responsibility for the pagan authors should be handed over to the present speaker (Utrecht). The work, however, was to be done in close contact between the two centres, under the supervision of a committee consisting of Professors Aland, Delling (Halle), Riesenfeld (Uppsala) and van Unnik (Utrecht), to whom an English scholar will be added at a future date. The work is sponsored by the Kommission für spätantike

* Appeared in *New Testament Studies*, III, 1957, p. 254-259

¹ Read at the Eleventh General Meeting of the S.N.T.S., 6 September 1956.

² Cf. *N.T.S.*, II (February 1956), pp. 217-21.

Religionsgeschichte of the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin and the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen in Amsterdam. In entering upon our task, Professor Delling and I do not do so in any mood of fatalism: on the contrary, we hope to be more successful than our predecessors in this field (Heinrici, von Dobschütz, Windisch), who all died before entering the promised land. In informing you about what has happened, what will be the next steps to be taken and what we are aiming at, I shall occasionally have to distinguish between the two different branches, because the state of affairs and the problems involved make such a separate treatment necessary.

I. *Work done in the Past Year*

1. In *Halle*. Professor Delling, working with his assistant, has compared the material on cards with the annotations of Wettstein. This comparison has shown that there were all sorts of lacunae which have now been filled. There was much fresh material, not in Wettstein, mainly collected by Windisch. The cards had to be rearranged according to the texts of the New Testament to which they serve as a commentary.

2. In *Utrecht*. The work only started here in March of this year; Professor Riesenfeld was unable to send off sooner the material under his care. Two part-time assistants were appointed by the Board of Curators of the University for this work after the arrival of the twenty-one boxes of the collection. They arrived quite safely, though the state of the original boxes was somewhat fragile. It appeared that the material was arranged according to various authors, and within each group according to the sequence of the books of the New Testament. A list made by Lic. H. Hanse in 1938 was found and the whole collection was checked from this list, the result being that the state of affairs was still the same as in 1938, with the exception of a small number of slips on Epictetus, added by Fridrichsen. The major part of the material is derived from the old Wettstein, but the classical authors have been quoted from the latest editions. Some authors, however, have received a completely fresh treatment, for example, for Xenophon there are 1500 slips; the same holds good for the "Tactici". Here and there material from Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (4th ed.), Joh. Weiss, *Erster Korintherbrief*, M. Dibelius, *Jakobusbrief*, has been incorporated, but this does not appear to have been done very systematically.

A sheaf of various papers of different sizes was found in one of the boxes; it contained notes taken haphazardly from various classical authors and made by different hands. The origin of this material was manifestly British, and in all probability these pieces of paper belong to the collections made for the "revised Wettstein" which the S.P.C.K. planned early in this century, but which was abandoned in favour of the German work.³ This inspection brought to light the fact that various classical authors who most certainly should be there are missing; they must be strolling about somewhere in the world. To give two examples: Plutarch is not there and it is probable that his cards are still in the hands of the author of *Plutarch und das neue Testament*, which was Dr Almquist's doctoral thesis, done under the supervision of Fridrichsen⁴. Professor H. J. Cadbury, who to our great joy is present here, confessed to me this afternoon that the cards on Lucian put at his disposal by von Dobschütz are still in his keeping, and that he, being unable to carry the work further, would return them to their brethren, but not without interest, because he promised a number of his own notes from inscriptions and papyri. May this set an example! I sincerely hope that this notice will help to bring back other lost sheep to the fold (the fold in this case being the Theologisch Instituut van de Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht, Trans 10), and if some interest should be added it would be very much appreciated! To this description of the present state of affairs must be added the news that all the volumes of Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum N.T.* have been checked; references found there, but not in the Corpus Hellenisticum, have been added to the material.

II. *The Next Steps*

1. It will be clear that Halle is nearer to the goal than Utrecht. The number of authors involved in the scheme of the Judaeo-Hellenisticum is much smaller than that in the Pagano-Hellenisticum. More work of comparing the Jewish authors with the New Testament has been done than in the case of the classical writers. Besides, these Jewish sources are in many ways nearer to the New Testament than the pagan ones (cf. below p. 180 f.).

³ See C. L. Hulbert-Powell, *John James Wettstein* (London, 1938), p. 273.

⁴ H. Almquist, *Plutarch und das Neue Testament* (Uppsala-Kopenhagen, 1948); this is a useful collection of materials, but has missed several important parallels.

2. In *Halle* what is extant of the minor Jewish-Hellenistic writers will be investigated. It will be necessary to examine the old, but still useful collections of Grinfield.⁵ As far as Josephus is concerned Professor D. K. H. Rengstorf (Münster, Westfalen) has promised his valuable assistance; on the basis of a manuscript of A. Schlatter he is making an index to Josephus and it goes without saying that such a work will be an enormous help.

3. In *Utrecht* the situation is that virtually a fresh start has to be made on the old foundations of Wettstein. A few cases excepted, the investigation of nearly all authors is not beyond the stage of preparation. A list of classical authors will be made and discussed with a group of classical scholars. Following these consultations we hope to issue a joint invitation from Halle-Utrecht to the scholarly world, asking for effective assistance. This appeal will be sent to individual scholars, and to the learned world in general through various periodicals, in order that it may become known to all interested in this project.

My first experiences in this field have made me optimistic: a short notice in the Dutch press met with a very encouraging response from various classical students. In this connexion I may also mention the fine example set by Dr A. Ehrhardt, here present, who put at my disposal his interleaved Nestle with some 300 quotations from classical sources, not to be found in the usual collections. We are extremely grateful for this ready response, and it makes me express the hope that others will do the same. Our task will be to go through the old branch of "Observationes"-literature, of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries mainly, in which many treasures are left in hidden places; in particular, the huge volumes of the *Critici Sacri* call for careful examination. Presumably this task will be sufficient for next year or even the next few years, and it will not leave us time for gleaning the fields of the journals. In this connexion we shall also have to appeal to our colleagues in various countries, because it is to be feared that a number of these periodicals may be inaccessible.

4. It was part of the old project of Heinrici that a series of monographs should accompany the edition of a new Wettstein.⁶

⁵ E. W. Grinfield, *Novum Testamentum Graecum, editio hellenistica* (London, 1843), 2 vols.; *Scholia hellenistica in Novum Testamentum* (London, 1848), 2 vols. (illustrations drawn from the LXX, Philo, Josephus and the Apostolic Fathers).

Dr Almquist's thesis, mentioned above, was inspired by the same idea. For the practical use of the future Corpus it will be advisable to remove from its pages all that is not strictly necessary for the elucidation of the text. An exact evaluation of the relation between a given author (or group of authors) and the New Testament can only be undertaken in a separate treatise.⁷ Therefore such a series of special volumes preparing and accompanying the Corpus Hellenisticum itself is again envisaged.

III. *The Aim*

When Heinrici and his colleagues started in 1915 it was quite clear that they were aiming at a new "Wettstein" to replace the old one of 1751, which had so admirably served the scholarly world for more than 150 years. All parallels from Graeco-Roman authors were to be included, but the rabbinical data, which the old Wettstein contained, were to be excluded. It will be remembered that the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century had seen the rediscovery of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods of the ancient world, the real background of the New Testament. It was the flourishing time of the "religionsgeschichtliche Schule": the words of the New Testament were read in the new light which the findings of lexicography shed upon its pages. It was deemed appropriate to reap the fields and bring the harvest home in a renewed and up-to-date Corpus Hellenisticum. In this connexion it is worth while quoting a few sentences from the autobiography of von Dobschütz who served as the leader of the new venture for many years. His words clearly bring to light what was the aim and inspiring spirit behind the work. He said:

"Ich habe mit Freuden von Heinrici die Aufgabe übernommen, die große Parallelensammlung des alten Wettstein zeitgemäß zu erneuern. Mit Hilfe eines großen Stabes von Mitarbeitern hoffe ich, in nicht all zu ferner Zeit, das Riesenwerk eines Corpus Hellenisticum zum Neuen Testament zustande zu bringen, in dem man zu jeder neutestamentlichen Stelle alles Material aus der griechisch-römischen Literatur gesammelt finden soll, was der Erklärung dieser Stelle unter formalen wie unter sachlichen Gesichtspunkten dienen

⁶ Cf. E. von Dobschütz, *Geleitwort*, in C. F.-G. Heinrici, *Die Hermes-mystik und das Neue Testament* (Leipzig, 1918), pp. iii-iv.

⁷ As was, for example, admirably done by A. Bonhöfer, *Epiktet und das N.T.* (Giessen, 1911).

kann. Man muß alles sammeln, um nachher zu sichten. Vieles, was zunächst als Parallele erscheint, erweist sich bei näherem Zusehen als ganz andersartig bedingt und eingestellt. Gerade darin berühre ich mich auf das engste mit Georg Heinrici, daß ich sein immer wiederholtes 'Ceterum censeo: Distinguamus' auf das nachdrücklichste zu betonen nicht müde wurde.⁸

Meanwhile more than twenty-five years have elapsed and the steps taken towards the goal are very few; we must say that the work practically came to a standstill through the deaths of von Dobschütz and Windisch, the crises of the Nazi régime, World War II and its sequel.

During this period of stagnation the whole enterprise has come to assume a quite different complexion.

Since I became involved in this work, I have given much thought to the way in which the plan should be realized, and I am beginning to think that difficulties have been underestimated by the original group of workers. It is quite simple to say: "All parallels to the New Testament from Greek and Roman authors should be collected", but what does this mean in practice? For the tracing of the way, two facts seem very important to me: (1) it was a matter of course that the rabbinical material should be excluded from the outset, and since then the invaluable work of Billerbeck has come, which no scholar can praise too highly. But it must be realized that the case for the Hellenistic material is different and more difficult. Between the New Testament and the rabbinic sources there is a common substratum, both building in one way or another upon the Old Testament foundations, which is missing for the Corpus Hellenisticum. It was wise to separate the "Judaean" from the "Pagan-Hellenistic" because, in the former case, the relation to the New Testament is different from that in the latter, precisely because of the common substratum that is found here also; in the case of pagan authors the situation is quite different and needs careful consideration. (2) The old Wettstein contained much material of a lexicographical nature. When Heinrici made his plans, the new discoveries in this field had not yet been put to the best possible use (cf. Deissmann's criticism of Preuschen's *Wörterbuch*).⁹ Since then, however, Walter Bauer has completed his magnificent and indis-

⁸ E. von Dobschütz, *Die Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen* (Leipzig, 1928), IV, p. 49.

⁹ A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*¹ (Tübingen, 1923), p. 347.

pensable lexicon in three editions, Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary* has been published and Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch* has become an essential tool for all serious work; much illustrative material which formerly would have been incorporated in the *Corpus Hellenisticum* has been given in these books, and there is no need for repetition—and this again raises the question what should be inserted.

The big question is: what are parallels? I fully endorse the words of von Dobschütz quoted before, both in their positive and negative aspects. In cases like the "Haustafeln"¹⁰ and the tax-collectors¹¹ the procedure is fairly clear. But it is in my opinion also worth while looking for "counter-parallels", for example alongside the Creation go other ideas about the origin of the world (cf. the paper of Dr Eltester, in *N.T.S.* III 93 ff.). There are certain subjects which occur in the New Testament only occasionally, but which are of the utmost importance for the ancient world, such as "custom" (ἔθος, *mos maiorum*). To see the New Testament in a proper perspective one is bound to give a very full treatment to such conceptions. Attention should also be paid to certain combinations of words which formed stereotyped formulae, the discovery of which is the more difficult, since slight changes may have been introduced. Stylistic parallels of a more general kind must, I think, be collected in a separate volume.

As for the practical work it will be advisable to abandon the old rule of von Dobschütz that the parallels had to be given at the *first* place where they occur in the New Testament. Following that rule the notes to St Matthew would be unduly full, while those to St Luke would be comparatively scanty, a most awkward situation for a *Corpus Hellenisticum*. The proper place is not the first one, but the *most important* one, and for the Synoptic Gospels it will be advisable to follow a Synopticon.

In collecting this material from the Graeco-Roman world we must try to catch all light this world may shed upon the New Testament; we must try to find out agreement and distinction in order to come to a fuller understanding of the message of the New

¹⁰ K. Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln* (Leipzig, 1928); A. Vögtle, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im N.T.* (Münster i. Westf., 1936).

¹¹ W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des N.T.*⁴ (Berlin, 1952), col. 1476 gives a number of unfavourable judgements. Cf. also Dio Chrys. *Orat.* XIV, 14.

Testament. We are fully aware that this is an enormous task; and we hope for and urgently request the help of many fellow-scholars. But we are sure that our Lord will give strength for a task which is in the service of His Word. Behind this work stands the same inspiration as behind all our work in the New Testament, that confidence so marvellously expressed in these lines of the "Hymn of the Pilgrim Fathers":

"The Lord hath yet more light and truth
To break forth from His Word".

A FORMULA DESCRIBING PROPHECY *

In the opening section of the recently discovered (and now published) Gnostic "Apocryphon of John", the Revealer says to John: "Now I have come to reveal to you *that which is, that which has been, and that which will be*, so that you may know the things which are seen and the things not seen and to reveal to you about the perfect Man".¹

As a parallel to this passage Puech referred to *Sap. Sal.* vii 17-21, where Solomon declares God to be the source of his wisdom.² Among other things it is said that God gave him to know ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος καὶ μεσότητα χρόνων . . . ὅσα τέ ἐστιν κρυπτὰ καὶ ἐμφανῆ ἔργων. These are mentioned besides the insight Solomon had into the course of nature and human affairs, and this makes the comparison less striking than it may seem at first sight. The second part of this quotation offers some parallelism, though the Greek original of *A.J.* certainly read ὁρατὰ καὶ ἀόρατα. In the former part the parallelism is even less convincing, since the wording is quite different, although on both sides there is a tripartite division of history.

It is on this beginning of the quotation (the words in italics) that we will focus our attention in this paper, because a number of almost identical expressions can be found in pagan and Christian literature. They show that the author of *A.J.* did not invent this phrase, but used an existing formula which had a certain weight and therefore throws an interesting light on his intentions.

Till and Grant (*loc. cit.*) do not mention the text from the Book of Wisdom, but refer to Apoc. i 19: γράψον οὖν ἃ εἶδες καὶ ἃ εἰσὶν καὶ ἃ μέλλει γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα. It may be remarked, what has not been noticed so far, that also in the Epilogue some reminiscences of the same passage of the Apocalypse are found: "I say this to you, so that you may write it down . . . I will proclaim to you what will

* Appeared in *New Testament Studies*, IX, 1963, p. 86-94.

¹ R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism, a Sourcebook of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period* (New York, 1961), p. 70; see also the *editio princeps* of W. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (Texte und Untersuchungen, vol. IX)*, (Berlin, 1955), p. 85.

² H. Ch. Puech, *Gnostische Evangelien und verwandte Dokumente* in E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*³ (Tübingen, 1959), pp. 235 f.

take place; and indeed I have given you this, so that you may write it down".³ It is interesting to find these echoes in the beginning and the end of *A.J.* It seems as though the author wants to stand in a certain apocalyptic tradition, although the contents of the book are *toto coelo* different from apocalyptic revelations.

Many commentators like Bousset, Swete, Charles and Lohmeyer⁴ explain Apoc. i 19 as a rough outline of the following book: α εἶδες (cf. v. 20) is the vision of the heavenly Christ in ch. i; α εἰσὶν the letters in chs. ii and iii, whereas α μέλλει γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα is taken up again in iv 1 ff. Moffatt⁵ objected to this exegesis, mainly because this theme would not be in right proportion with the book; according to him "the real sense is that the contents of the vision . . . consist of what is and what is to be, these divisions of present and future underlying the whole subsequent Apocalypse". For the moment we may leave this point of dispute and turn our attention to two facts: (a) in the formula of i 19 the last part forms a favourite expression in the Apocalypse, see i 1; iv 1; xxii 6, but there is a slight difference in wording: all other texts have α δεῖ γενέσθαι in accordance with Dan. ii 28, 45, while here the expression α μέλλει γενέσθαι is used as in Isa. xlviii 6. The meaning may be almost the same, yet the difference may be of some importance; (b) the parallelism between this text and the sentence from *A.J.* shows an interesting difference in the sequence of the elements: Apocalypse = past, present, future; *A.J.* = present, past, future, and in the element describing the past there is not only the variation of place, but also of words: Apocalypse α εἶδες—*A.J.* "that which has been", and in this light it is somewhat peculiar that the Apocalypse uses a past tense of "to see" and not of "to be". Has *A.J.* made a change here to what seemed reasonable? But if so, how are we to explain the difference in the order of the clauses? Is *A.J.* dependent on the Apocalypse or not?

Before we try to give an answer to these and similar questions by

³ R. M. Grant, *in loc.*, p. 85 (the text of Puech, *loc. cit.* p. 241, from another code is slightly different).

⁴ W. Bousset, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*⁶ (Göttingen, 1906); H.B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St John* (London, 1906); R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St John* (Edinburgh, 1920); E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*² (Tübingen, 1953), all *in loc.* (this exegesis is already found in the "Annotationes" of Hugo Grotius in the middle of the seventeenth century).

⁵ J. Moffatt, *The Revelation of St John the Divine, The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. V (London, 1910), *in loc.*

conjecture, it may be useful to broaden our outlook. For neither the Apocalypse nor *A.J.* came into existence in a vacuum. Although it is of the highest importance to know that the Apocalypse stands in the tradition of Jewish apocalyptic, one should not forget that it was written in a strongly hellenistic part of the Roman Empire. And although *A.J.* is most decidedly Gnostic, one should not overlook the fact that the editor of the book, as we have it now, wished to be a *Christian* Gnostic.

In the interesting and extremely difficult survey of the teachings of the Naassenes it is said (Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, V, 7, 20) that they not only draw a testimony in favour of their doctrine from the mysteries of the Assyrians and the Phrygians, but also from the Egyptians *περὶ τὴν τῶν γεγενημένων καὶ γινομένων καὶ ἔσομένων ἔτι μακαρίαν κρυβομένην ὁμοῦ καὶ φανερουμένην φύσιν*. Later in the same chapter (V, 7, 29) we are told of the Greek God Hermes *ἐρμηνεύς ὢν καὶ δημιουργὸς τῶν γεγονότων ὁμοῦ καὶ γινομένων καὶ ἔσομένων*. There is no need at the moment to discuss the context in detail. Sufficient be it to see that here a formula closely similar to that in *A.J.*, again with variation in order, is found. It is the real essence of the Egyptian mysteries in which hidden and disclosed, the totality of existence in its three aspects of past, present and future, is comprised. Hermes is called the interpreter and creator of this riddle of the growing and passing existence. The way in which these words are used here gives the strong impression that they were not invented by the Naassenes for this particular occasion, but that they formed part and parcel of their vocabulary, because they were appropriate to express the eternal riddle that lies at the bottom of Gnosticism, the puzzle of existence with its growth and decay. But were they the first to use this formula? However that may be, it is interesting to notice that Hermes, the herald of the gods, is mentioned here as the one who explains this mystery.

But this formula, though in a different wording, is not confined to the Gnostics. In the Epistle of Barnabas, which is almost contemporaneous with *A.J.*, one finds a similar, tripartite formula applied to the special Christian revelation which is expounded by the author. By the prophecies of the O.T. the Lord has made known his will, and it is the aim of Barnabas to show how these prophecies speak about Jesus Christ and his church. This is expressed in the opening chapter, i 7: *ἐγνώρισεν γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ δεσπότης διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τὰ παρεληλυθότα καὶ τὰ ἐνεστῶτα, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων δούς ἀπαρχὰς*

ἡμῖν γεύσεως. The same idea returns in v 3 as a reason for deep gratitude: ὅτι καὶ τὰ παρεληλυθότα ἡμῖν ἐγνώρισεν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐνεστῶσιν ἡμᾶς ἐσόφισεν, καὶ εἰς τὰ μέλλοντα οὐκ ἐσμέν ἀσύνητοι (cf. also xvii 2 ἐὰν γὰρ περὶ τῶν ἐνεστῶτων ἢ μελλόντων γράφω ὑμῖν). It is clear that the author uses a standing formula: the Christian revelation has to do with past, present and future. It has been revealed *through the prophets* of whom Barnabas is more or less the interpreter.

This connexion with prophecy is not a peculiarity of this epistle. Windisch, in his indispensable commentary,⁶ has collected a number of parallel texts which call for some comments and may be supplemented from various sources.

In his *Apology* Theophilus describes his conversion, since he became convinced by the fulfilment of the prophecies (I, 14): οἱ καὶ προεῖπον διὰ πνεύματος θεοῦ τὰ προγεγονότα ᾧ τρόπῳ γέγονεν καὶ τὰ ἐνεστῶτα τίνι τρόπῳ γίνεται καὶ τὰ ἐπερχόμενα ποίᾳ τάξει ἀπαρτισθήσεται. The same idea is expressed with some variation in II, 9, where it is said that the prophets were inspired by the Spirit of God and were taught by God: σύμφωνα εἰρήκασιν, τὰ τε πρὸ αὐτῶν γεγενημένα καὶ τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς γεγονότα καὶ τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς νυνὶ τελειούμενα· διὸ καὶ πεπείσμεθα καὶ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων οὕτως ἔσεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἀπήρτισται. The remarkable thing here is that this idea of prophecy is not only applied to the O.T. prophets, but also to the Greek Sibylla and all the others who spoke in good harmony. That Theophilus is using here a generally accepted standard formula, by which even a pagan can measure the truth, appears from II, 33. There the superiority of the Christian Scriptures is proved over the writings of the Egyptian and Chaldaean prophets by saying that if these authors had been inspired by the divine spirit καὶ οὐ μόνον τὰ προγενόμενα ἢ ἐνεστῶτα ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐπερχόμενα τῷ κόσμῳ ἐχρῆν αὐτοὺς προκαταγγεῖλαι, that is the totality of human history. Irenaeus expresses the same idea of this inspiration by the Spirit of God in *Adv. Haer.* IV, 33, 1, "futura annuntiavit et praesentia ostendit et praeterita enarrat". The close connexion with the O.T. prophets is also expressed by Hippolytus, *De Antichristo*, 2, οἱ μακάριοι προφῆται ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν ἐγένοντο . . . οὐ μόνον τὰ παρωχηκότα εἰπόντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐνεστῶτα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἀπαγγεῖλαντες, ἵνα μὴ μόνον πρόσκαιρος εἶναι ὁ προφήτης δειχθῇ,

⁶ H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief* (Tübingen, 1920), p. 307 (he gives the texts of Theophilus, Irenaeus, Ps.-Clem. II, 6, Hippolytus [*Blessing of Jacob*], Philo and the papyrus which will be quoted in the following pages).

ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσαις γενεαῖς προλέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα ἀληθῶς προφήτης εἶναι νομισθῇ. This character of the prophetic office, that is, to speak about past, present and future, is therefore a guarantee for its trustworthiness (cf. also Hippolytus, *On the Blessings of Jacob*, 10, οἱ γὰρ τὰ προπαρωχηκότα καὶ τὰ ἐνεστῶτα εἰπόντες πιστοὶ ὑφ' ἡμῶν κρίνονται, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι;). This standard of distinguishing the true prophet is also used in the Pseudo-Clementines, *Hom.* II, 6, 1, προφήτης δὲ ἀληθείας ἐστὶν ὁ πάντοτε πάντα εἰδώς, τὰ μὲν γεγονότα ὡς ἐγένετο, τὰ δὲ γινόμενα ὡς γίνεται, τὰ δὲ ἐσόμενα ὡς ἔσται (cf. also *Rec.* I, 21, 7).⁷ In *Hom.* III, 11, 2, we find the same in a somewhat abbreviated form: προφήτης δὲ ἀληθής ἐστὶν ὁ πάντα πάντοτε εἰδώς. This recalls the phrase from the N.T. John iv 25 ff. Is it so that the more elaborate form is a mixture of two?

From these texts we may conclude that in the second century and still in the third a certain formula existed among Christians which could be given in varying words to describe the true prophet. It was required that he could survey by divine inspiration the whole of history in its three aspects of past, present and future. By these Christian authors it is strongly bound up with the O.T. prophecies, but not wholly, as appears both from Irenaeus who speaks (*loc. cit.*) about the "spiritual man" in general, and from the Ps.-Clementines. But these O.T. prophecies prove their veracity by meeting the general requirement. From Theophilus it is clear that this standard of reference was also accepted in circles outside the Christian church. It is remarkable that this requirement is not mentioned in passages which deal with the distinction between the true and false prophet like Hermas, *Mand.* xi. In the second century there was a crisis with regard to prophetism in Christian circles,⁸ but as far as I can see the present formula is never used in that connexion, the criteria being quite different. The terms used have a certain literary flavour. These observations lead us to direct our attention outside the boundaries of the Christian church.

In perusing the list of parallels given by Windisch one is struck by the fact that no texts from the Bible and later Jewish literature, not even of Josephus, are mentioned. Two texts from Philo are

⁷ Cf. also *Hom.* II, 10, 1, εἰ προφήτης ἐστὶν καὶ δύναται εἰδέναι ὡς ἐγένετο ὁ κόσμος καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ γινόμενα καὶ τὰ εἰς τέλος ἐσόμενα, ἐὰν ἡμῖν ἤ τι προειρηκώς ὁ εἰς τέλος ἐγνώκαμεν γεγεννημένον, καλῶς αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν ἤδη γεγεννημένων καὶ τὰ ἐσόμενα ἔσεσθαι πιστεύομεν, οὐ μόνον ὡς γινώσκοντι, ἀλλὰ καὶ προγινώσκοντι.

⁸ M. Dibelius, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (Tübingen, 1923), pp. 1538 ff.

adduced, but they are not culled from contexts dealing with prophecy. Both describe the capacity of the *Nous*. In *De spec. leg.* I, 334, part of a passage which explains the meaning of Deut. xxiii, the various categories which are excluded from the people of God, he speaks about those who deify the *Nous*, most likely Stoics.⁹ They ascribe to the *Nous* the government of human affairs and say *ικανὸν εἶναι καὶ τὰ παρεληλυθότα μνήμη διασφῆζειν καὶ τῶν παρόντων ἔρρωμένως ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα εἰκότι στοχασμῷ φαντασιοῦσθαι τε καὶ λογίζεσθαι*. According to *Leg. Alleg.* II, 42, Philo is quite willing to accept that the *Nous* τῶν τριῶν ἐφάπτεται χρόνων, καὶ γὰρ τὰ παρόντα νοεῖ καὶ τῶν παρεληλυθότων μέμνηται καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα προσδοκᾷ, but his objection is directed against its deification. It is apparent that Philo is summarizing teachings from Greek philosophers and quotes their opinion. If he knew this formula in connexion with the human *Nous* which was considered the divine part in man, then it was on good purpose that he did not apply this sentence to prophecy. At any rate Philo strictly confines this formula to the human sphere, stripped of its divine connotations. But those opponents who applied it to the *Nous* certainly knew that it was a divine element; and they belong to "paganism". But is it merely an epistemological category and how came this divine character to be connected with it? So Philo is not a direct parallel to Barnabas, for although the formula is found there, it is used in quite a different sense. Nevertheless, Philo gives some useful information.

Far more interesting, however, is a prayer of a magician which is the last item referred to by Windisch. In this text from a London Papyrus¹⁰ he prays that when consultants from all over the earth come to him he may know ὅπως αὐτοῖς ἐξαγγείλω τὰ προγεγονότα αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνεστώτα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα αὐτοῖς ἔσεσθαι and know everything about their work and lives . . . καὶ ἀπαγγείλω αὐτοῖς πάντα ἐξ ἀληθείας (cf. also before τὰ γεγονότα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι). In comparison with the texts discussed before it is noteworthy that here the word αὐτοῖς has been added. In the other texts the formula comprised the totality of history, but here it is applied to the

⁹ See the note of I. Heinemann, *Philo von Alexandria, die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung* (Breslau, 1910), II, p. 103, n. 2.

¹⁰ Windisch only gives an abstract; the text from Kenyon, *Greek Papyri*, was reprinted in a more extensive form in R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*³ (Leipzig, 1927), p. 239.

totality of the history of certain individuals. This knowledge is only acquired by divine inspiration which is prayed for. Remarkable is the element of ἀλήθεια at the end. Here again, but now on "pagan" soil, we meet the formula in a prophetic context.

This sorcerer stands in an age-long tradition. In the following pages I shall give a selection of texts from Greek and Roman authors ¹¹ which, I am sure, is far from exhaustive. But they seem sufficiently illuminating and interesting for the present purpose. Since the formula has never been discussed in its wider religious and philosophical context, it seemed worthwhile to give even this preliminary survey in the hope that some readers of this paper will be so kind as to send additional material, when they find it, for which the author is deeply grateful in advance.

Since the Naassenes found their wisdom also in the Egyptian mysteries (see p. 185), we may think in this connexion of the famous statue of Isis in Sais which had, according to Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 9, the inscription beginning with the well-known revelation-formula "I am": ¹² ἐγὼ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὄν καὶ ἐσόμενον. The goddess reveals herself as the totality of existence, but nobody of mortal men has ever discovered her essence. Here again it is expressed in the threefold division of time, and its mysterious character is apparent from the way in which and the person by whom this declaration is given.

Not always is this tripartition of time surrounded by religious connotations; it may simply be an all-embracing term for "in history", as in Cicero, *Oratio post reditum ad Quirites*, 7, "Cn. Pompeius, vir omnium qui sunt, fuerunt, erunt . . . principes". In various poems of Catullus the formula returns:

- 21, 2-4 Aureli, pater esuritionum,
non harum modo, sed quot aut fuerunt
aut sunt aut aliis erunt in annis.
- 24, 2-4 O qui flosculus es Iuventiorum,
non horum modo, sed quot aut fuerunt
aut posthac aliis erunt in annis.

¹¹ O. Weinreich, *Aion in Eleusis*, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XIX (1918), 178 ff., has collected some Greek texts, but does not mention the Latin texts, except for Ps.-Apuleius, nor the "prophetic aspect in Greek literature". Some of the new material I owe to the assistance of my collaborator for the "Corpus Hellenisticum", Mr G. Mussies, litt. hum. dr.

¹² H. Almquist, *Plutarch und das Neue Testament* (Uppsala, 1946), p. 138.

- 49, 1-3 Disertissime Romuli nepotum
 quot sunt quotque fuere, Marce Tulli,
 quotque post aliis erunt in annis.

The use of these almost identical phrases may be a poetical device, but on the other hand one cannot exclude the idea that it was more or less a standard expression, a term hallowed by its sacred origin.¹³

Two other interesting texts from Latin poets bring the formula in connexion with prophecy. In Ovid, *Metam.* I, 517-18, Apollo declares that he is not an ordinary man, but the god by whom

... quod eritque, fuitque
 estque patet. ...

He is the great god of the oracles, by whom all things of existence are made clear. Something similar is said in Vergil, *Georg.* IV, 392-3, about Proteus:

... novit namque omnia vates
 quae sint, quae fuerint, quae mox ventura trahantur.

It is highly probable that this goes back to Greek examples. As such one can think of Homer, *Iliad* A 70, where it is said about the seer Calchas δς ἤδη τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα. An echo of this is found in Hesiod, *Theogonia*, 38: the Muses uniting their voices εἰρεῦσαι τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα (cf. also v. 32, the description of the inspiration given by the Muses to the poet who receives a sceptre, a flourishing olive-branch, which marks him as the herald of the gods; the Muses inspire him with a heavenly voice ἵνα κλείοιμι τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα).

This conception of the connexion between our formula and prophecy is thus not only old, but is also met in two authors who exercised a great influence in later antiquity.¹⁴ Another example, probably dating from Roman times,¹⁵ is found in an *Orphic Hymn*, 25, 4-5, where Proteus is described as being

¹³ Cf. also Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, I, 460-1, about "time" as an abstraction:

... transactum quid sit in aevo
 tum quae res instet: quod porro deinde sequatur.

¹⁴ The use of Homer and Hesiod in the teaching of the schools is well known; see also the remark of G. M. A. Hanfmann, "Muses", in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1949), p. 583: "Throughout antiquity the prevailing conception of the Muses follows Hesiod".

¹⁵ Cf. M. P. Nilsson, "Orphic Literature", in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*,

... ἐπιστάμενος τὰ τ' ἐόντα
ὅσα τε πρόσθεν ἦν ὅσα τ' ἔσσεται ὕστερον αὖτις

(cf. also Virgil, above).

Weinreich remarked¹⁶ that the pre-Socratic philosophers had a certain predilection for this formula. He quotes Heraclitus, fr. 30, κόσμον τόνδε, τὸν αὐτὸν ἀπάντων οὔτε τις θεῶν οὔτε ἀνθρώπων ἐποίησεν, ἀλλ' ἦν αἰεὶ καὶ ἔστιν καὶ ἔσται πῦρ αἰεζῶον and Melissus, fr. 2, ὅτε τοίνυν οὐκ ἐγένετο, ἔστι τε καὶ αἰεὶ ἦν καὶ αἰεὶ ἔσται. We may add Empedocles, fr. 21 (ap. Aristotle, *Metaph.* 1000 A 30), who calls the four eternal elements the origin of ὅσα τ' ἦν ὅσα τ' ἔσθ' ὅσα τ' ἔσται ὁπίσσω. Here the formula expresses the eternity of existence. Plato in his *Timaeus*, 37 E-38 A, quotes and criticizes this way of putting things, because the notion of time cannot be applied to eternity: ταῦτα δὲ πάντα μέρη χρόνου, καὶ τό τ' ἦν τό τ' ἔσται χρόνου γεγονότα εἶδη, ἃ δὴ φέροντες λαμβάνομεν ἐπὶ τὴν αἰδίδιον οὐσίαν οὐκ ὀρθῶς. λέγομεν γὰρ δὴ ὡς ἦν ἔστιν τε καὶ ἔσται, τῇ δὲ τὸ ἔστιν μόνον κατὰ τὸν ἀληθῆ λόγον προσήκει, τὸ δὲ ἦν τό τ' ἔσται περὶ τὴν ἐν χρόνῳ γένεσιν ἰοῦσαν πρέπει λέγεσθαι. But as Weinreich aptly remarked: "Das ist streng philosophisch genommen zwar richtig, aber der weniger scharfe Sprachgebrauch sowohl der Philosophen wie namentlich der religiösen Rede hat sich jederzeit dieser 'Drei-zeiten-Formel', wie ich sie nennen möchte, bedient, um mit ihr eine ewige Dauer zu bezeichnen" (p. 178). From the testimony of Philo (see above, p. 188) we may deduce that the expression was current in certain Stoic circles. In an Eleusinian inscription for Aion dating from the time of Augustus, which was commented upon by Weinreich, this god is called εἷς κατὰ τὰ αὐτά, ὁποῖος ἔστι καὶ ἦν καὶ ἔσται. Pausanias (X, 12, 5) quotes an old Dodonian oracle proclaiming: Ζεὺς ἦν, Ζεὺς ἔστι, Ζεὺς ἔσσεται, ὦ μεγάλε Ζεῦ (cf. *Tübinger Theosophia*, ἦν Ζεὺς ἔστι τε νῦν Ζεὺς καὶ ἔσσεται).¹⁷ In the well-known Hermetic treatise (Ps.-Apuleius) *Asclepius* the formula is found three times:

14 Deus ergo sempiternus, deus aeternus, nec nasci potest nec potuit; hoc est, hoc fuit, hoc erit semper; haec ergo est, quae ex se tota est, natura dei;

p. 627: "a number of Hymns to various gods, probably composed in Asia Minor in the Roman age".

¹⁶ O. Weinreich, *loc. cit.* p. 178.

¹⁷ Published by K. Buresch, *Klaros, Untersuchungen zum Orakelwesen des späteren Altertums* (Leipzig, 1889), p. 100.

29 si enim animal mundus vivensque semper et fuit et est et erit, nihil in mundo mortale est.

34 quod totum est bonum, decens et prudens, inimitabile et ipsi soli sensibile atque intellegibile et sine hoc nec fuit aliquid nec est nec erit. omnia enim ab eo et in ipso et per ipsum.

A survey of these examples brings to light that there was not a special word-order: "past, present, future", but that the elements change their places, although the future tense usually stands at the end. The cause of these changes may be due to outward circumstances, such as the necessities of the poetical metre, but does not seem to be essential. Another fact that cannot be overlooked is the difference in wording we observe. This may be due to a certain habit of ancient rhetoric, the desire to express a certain given form in varying formulations.

This material leads us to two conclusions:

a. The differently worded formula "that which was, is and shall be" does not only express the eternal duration ("ewige Dauer"), but something that surpasses the merely temporal aspect, the mystery of existence, of history in its totality.

b) It was the privilege of the prophets, granted by divine inspiration, to have an insight into this mystery which they alone could declare, not in part, but as a whole.

When we now return to our starting-point (see p. 183), we see that the differences between Apoc. i 19 and *A.J.* in wording are not essential in themselves, but also that the relation between these two texts is not inevitably so that *A.J.* depends on Apoc. i. 19. Both stand in the same line; they make use of the same Greek formula, describing the office and privilege of a prophet.

With regard to the Apocalypse it should be noticed that the author changes the first clause in a very typical manner, stressing the visionary character of his prophecy (cf. also i 2). Such a change of existing formulas is not unusual in the Apocalypse. Other examples may be found in i. 4, 8, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ᾔν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, where, as has often been remarked by commentators, the author used a formula current in later Jewish and Gentile circles, but stressed the eschatological note by changing ὁ ἐσόμενος into ὁ ἐρχόμενος; and in xxii 18-19, as I pointed out in an article devoted to this formula.¹⁸

¹⁸ W. C. van Unnik, *De la règle Μῆτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans*

The prophetic character of the Apocalypse is evident and well known.¹⁹ The opening section of *A.J.* has, as I hope to show elsewhere, other typical phrases which belong to the "apocalyptic" vocabulary. Its author wanted his book to be considered as a *prophetic revelation*. This is not a peculiarity of his. As was pointed out as long ago as 1901 by Liechtenhahn, the prophetic element in Gnosticism was strongly marked.²⁰ But some stress may be laid on the fact that he used a terminology which was current in and understood by the church in general, and not by a particular group only. In this way he wanted no doubt to make his teachings acceptable to his "fellow spirits".

Two more general remarks may conclude this paper:

1. The study of this formula has revealed a certain aspect of "prophecy" which has been overlooked so far. A certain common pattern between Christian and "pagan" understanding of this phenomenon has come to light. A fresh study of prophetism within the church of the first centuries cannot leave aside the concepts found in the surrounding world.

2. The study of this formula is the result of work done for the "Corpus Hellenisticum" or "New Wettstein".²¹ This example may be an illustration of the far from easy way in which sometimes "parallels" must be collected; pieces of evidence, small and in themselves often insignificant, when combined, prove of great value. It may be at the same time an illustration of the services such a "Corpus" can render to a better understanding of the New Testament.

l'histoire du Canon, in *Vigiliae Christianae*, III (1949), 1 ff. (In this volume p. 123-156).

¹⁹ See e.g. Lohmeyer, *loc. cit.* pp. 7, 201.

²⁰ R. Liechtenhahn, *Die Offenbarung im Gnosticismus* (Göttingen, 1901), pp. 5 ff.

²¹ See my "Second Report on the Corpus Hellenisticum", *New Testament Studies*, III (1956-7), 254 ff. (in this volume p. 175-182).

CORPUS HELLENISTICUM NOVI TESTAMENTI *

It is said often and loudly that no institution on earth is more conservative than the university. Therefore if at this hour I should try to show that this is a superficial and unjust notion—not too difficult a task—someone might point out triumphantly that the solemnity that has brought us together here follows a traditional pattern.

It is always *more maiorum*, according to traditional custom, that we celebrate the birthday of the university with a public meeting of the senate, and still adhere to the ancient academic custom that the rector should give an address on a subject related to his field. At certain times, indeed, the *mos* reigns supreme over the university; the alumnus as doctor permanently possesses all rights “that by law or custom are connected with the doctorate”. The game here goes according to the rules in the book of *mores*.

It is by no accident or mannerism that here we use the Latin word *mos*. In the ancient world, and certainly in the Roman imperial period, traditional custom played an important rôle and ordinarily regulated the conduct of society and of the individual. According to the poet Ennius “the Roman state rested on the old customs and on her man power”,¹ true piety, in the judgment of the philosopher Porphyry, consisted in honoring the gods according to traditional custom.² The Jewish historian Josephus repeatedly appealed to this motive in defending those special customs in which the Jews differed from other peoples.³ These “unwritten laws” were often deemed of higher significance than the written ones.⁴ Whenever we thus speak of *mores*, a small part of the heritage for which we are in debt to the ancient world comes to light.

The question now arises whether Christianity, that other pillar on which our western culture rests to a large degree, has also made

** Appeared in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXIII, 1964, p. 17-33.

* Address of the Rector Magnificus of the State University of Utrecht, delivered in the Cathedral on the 327th anniversary of the University's founding, March 29, 1963. Translated from the Dutch by Sherman E. Johnson, Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California.

¹ *Apud* Cicero, *De Rep.* v, 1; Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* ii, 21.

² Porphyry, *Ad Marcellam* 18.

³ In both his *Ant.* and his *B. J.*, *passim*.

⁴ Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 76.

a contribution to this. Certainly, in the course of centuries, the churches have often shown themselves to be a bulwark of conservatism and traditionalism, and one can easily assume that they have made a solid contribution to the maintenance of the *mores*, or, if you will, to usage. When one investigates primitive Christianity at this point, one comes to the surprising conclusion that on the whole this concept plays no part. The N.T. very seldom speaks of what is "customary", and where it does it is not met with as a motive for the moral conduct of Christians, but only as something in the past, as a definition of Jewish customs.⁵ Obviously and decidedly, linguistic usage here indicates a far-reaching difference between early Christianity and its environment.

How is one to account for this difference on a point that so dominates life? Is it accidental, to be explained because of the lacunae in our source material, or is it determined by the very ground of N.T. Christianity?

This, indeed, is one of the questions posed in the work on the so-called Corpus Hellenisticum for the N.T., the aim of which is to collate and arrange the material from the Greek and Roman world that can be useful for interpreting and understanding the N.T.

Since the end of the Second World War, N.T. study has received new impulses from several directions. Here I need only recall the discovery, known to you all, of the famous Dead Sea scrolls and the extensive and important library of Gnostic writings from Upper Egypt; even after this long time the material disclosed by these important finds has not been fully published, let alone assimilated. I think too of the discussions that have gone on, in Germany particularly, but now in America too, of the so-called demythologizing program of Bultmann; and of the strong revival of interest in biblical study in Roman Catholic circles with its resultant implications for ecumenical discussion. Yet in the midst of all these developments one should not forget what I might almost call the classical tasks. And one of these is the Corpus Hellenisticum. Since in the past few years here in Utrecht we have again taken up the thread of this work, the significance of this Corpus Hellenisticum seems to me a fitting theme for an anniversary address.

⁵ Cf. H. Preisker, s. v. ἔθος, in G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, II, pp. 370 f., who nevertheless does not bring out sufficiently the significance that this word had for the ancient world.

I

A few moments ago I said that we had taken up the thread again, not that we had begun. The subject to be discussed already has a long history.

In 1751 there appeared in Amsterdam an edition of the N.T. that marks a high point in the development of biblical studies. The author of this truly monumental work, Johann Jakob Wettstein—who had been for about twenty years professor in the seminary of the Remonstrant Brotherhood, then located in Amsterdam—gathered up in it the labors of his life. With great accuracy he had laid down a vast amount of factual data for the exegesis of the N.T. and in such a compass as no one before him and few after him. One who leafs through the two folio volumes of Wettstein's edition⁶ is amazed again and again by the industry and talent by which this man achieved so colossal a work. Amazement rises even higher when one realizes that he had not been spared disappointment and suspicion.

Johann Jakob Wettstein was born in 1693 in Basel, and of Basler lineage;⁷ his family was one of many in that Swiss city which during many generations shed luster upon it. He was 37 years old when he left his ancestral home to come to Amsterdam because of a disciplinary action that had been instituted against him by his former teachers and friends, Frey and Iselin, to deprive him of his ecclesiastical functions.⁸ It is not surprising that after this sad experience he went to Amsterdam, for there his cousins had established a printing house where his "Prolegomena for a very accurate edition of the Greek N.T." was being prepared for publication. This book appeared in the year of his dismissal; it was very favorably received in the learned world and established his reputation once for all as a researcher. On this visit he came in contact with the Remon-

⁶ H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, *Novum Testamentum Graecum editionis receptae cum lectionibus variantibus codicum MSS, editionum aliarum, versionum et Patrum, nec non commentario pleniore ex scriptoribus veteribus Hebraeis, Graecis et Latinis Historiam et vim verborum illustrante opera et studio Joannis Jacobi Wettsteinii* (Amstelaedami MDCCLI-MDCCLII, 2 tomi).

⁷ On his biography, see W. J. Lente, *Het leven en werken van Johan Jakob Wettstein* (Leiden, 1902); C. L. Hulbert-Powell, *John James Wettstein 1693-1754, An Account of his Life, Work and some of his Contemporaries* (London, 1937).

⁸ His biographers deal with this extensively; a mere reference to these proceedings is sufficient for our purpose.

strants, who just then had a vacancy in their seminary. Although Wettstein had tried in vain to return to Basel, although there were initial difficulties with the municipality and with the Reformed church council, he was able nevertheless to settle permanently in Amsterdam. In our land, where classical studies flourished,⁹ in a circle where theological extremism was discouraged, he could work quietly and steadily for more than twenty years until his death in 1754. Apart from a few trips for research, all his time was occupied by teaching and by the preparation of his great edition, which was indeed his life's work. With perseverance, gifted with a retentive memory, he collected his data. Yet he did not shrivel into a mere paper scholar; the society of this bachelor, with his cheerful character in which seriousness and gaiety blended harmoniously, was esteemed by a wide circle of friends. The unpleasant experience of suspicion and condemnation that had been part of his life had not embittered him.

One may say with complete accuracy that this edition of the N.T. was Wettstein's lifework. Even in his student days—and he matriculated when he was thirteen years old—he was fascinated by the wealth of manuscripts available in the Basel library. Those of the N.T. especially attracted his attention; their differences among themselves and their divergences from the editions of the text then current made them striking. Here then, sketched in his masterly dissertation (1713), is the plan for his future scientific work: the establishment of the most accurate possible text of the N.T., based on the oldest MSS. This involved a total change in the existing situation, for the current editions had not been achieved by methodical investigation of the material available in MSS and ancient versions, but rested on a few late and rather poor MSS. The translations used by Protestants, such as, e.g., our *Statenvertaling* (the Dutch "Authorized Version"), were based on this degenerate text. If now the necessary scientific improvements were to be introduced into the basic text, this should precede the work of translation. But on this point there was great sensitivity, for it was feared that this would affect the divine character of the Holy Scriptures and the certainty of faith. So strong was the power of the so-called

⁹ Cf. J. G. Gerretzen, *Schola Hemsterhusiana, de herleving der Grieksche studien aan de Nederlandsche universiteiten in de achttiende eeuw van Perizonius tot en met Valckenaer* (Nijmegen-Utrecht, 1940).

*Textus Receptus*¹⁰ (the generally received text) in the middle of the eighteenth century, that Wettstein in his 1751 edition did not venture to print an improved text. More than a century was now to pass before the right principles for establishment of the N.T. text were to prevail—and then once for all. But Wettstein had indefatigably worked all his life, in study, travel, and correspondence, to bring together the material useful for improvement of the text. He recorded this in his edition, in detailed text-critical annotation, and in this he summed up the work of his life.

If he had done no more than this, his work would remain as pioneering in the history of N.T. science, a respectable turning point toward a more correct insight, but not to be regarded as having permanent value. After all, the intensive labor that has gone on since the middle of the previous century in the terrain of textual history has rendered this part of Wettstein's work completely obsolete. Why then is "Wettstein" so eagerly sought in the antiquarian book market; why does a publisher see that there is something to be gained by bringing out a photomechanical copy (which has recently appeared)? Here is one of those remarkable turns of history: the main object in Wettstein's work, which was textual criticism, has become obsolete, but what he himself thought of as put in for good measure constitutes the great value of his edition.

The title page announces that this edition of the text is also provided "with a rather complete commentary illustrating the meaning of the words from the ancient Hebrew, Greek and Latin writers". At the end of the second volume,¹¹ speaking "of the interpretation of the N.T.", he gave an account of its origin—a short piece whose brevity contrasts strongly with the copiousness of the text-critical prolegomena. There he tells how for more than forty years—and therefore from his student days on—he had been occupied in collecting from the Jewish and classical writers parallels that are important for elucidation of the N.T. It was, he confessed, not his original intention to publish these, but having noticed the great interest aroused by them, he had decided to let this material be printed also. He wished to give no commentary either in the manner of the theologians or in that of the grammarians, and there-

¹⁰ This was the usual designation, derived from the preface of the publisher in Elzevir's second edition (1633): *Textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus*.

¹¹ J. J. Wettstein, *loc. cit.*, II, p. 874.

fore there were no dogmatic dissertations on the text, but brief philological and historical explanations by means of parallels without further discussion.

According to his own explanation, he had collected the data for his commentary partly through independent reading but partly through borrowing from predecessors. In fact, Wettstein was here building on a tradition of which our fellow countryman Hugo de Groot is an illustrious representative.¹² Many had "gathered ears of corn" and in their *Spicilegia* had built up collections of *Observationes*; such a collection as the *Critici Sacri*, e.g., bears an impressive witness to this.¹³ But no one carried out this work—done by many in a haphazard way—so systematically and comprehensively as Wettstein. Therefore his work, or rather that part of it which refers to classical authors, remains to the present day a *Fundgrube solider Gelehrsamkeit*.¹⁴

Why is this? Wettstein himself explained that much remained to be done.¹⁵ But here—in contrast to the field of textual criticism—in the nineteenth century it came to a full stop. Gratefully, though often without due acknowledgment, men profited from his work, yet it was not continued at all. In N.T. discussions in the nineteenth century it was not philological but historical-critical questions—those having to do with the "authenticity" or "unauthenticity" of biblical books and the reconstruction of the "life of Jesus"—that *grosso modo* played the chief rôle.

About the turn of the century came a change. Research then was strongly stimulated, and in quite a new way, by the discovery of the papyri in Egypt, by excavations in all lands bordering on the Mediterranean, and by the religio-historical research brought into a sharp focus by the conspicuous phenomenon of the syncretism of various religions in the Roman imperial age. The study of Hellenism and the Roman empire, and therefore of the *Umwelt* of early Christianity, took on a different appearance. Most strikingly this renewal is precipitated in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum N.T.*, in Walter Bauer's

¹² See my article, *Hugo Grotius als uitlegger van het Nieuwe Testament*, *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* (n. s.), 25 (1932), pp. 1-48.

¹³ An unusually useful collection of humanistic commentators from the 16th and 17th centuries, from Lorenzo Valla down to and including Pricaeus, published in Utrecht and Amsterdam in the last decade of the 17th century.

¹⁴ Thus it is described by Hans Lietzmann, *An die Römer*³, p. 20.

¹⁵ J. J. Wettstein, *loc. cit.*, II, p. 876.

lexicographical masterpiece,¹⁶ and in the indispensable *Theologisches Wörterbuch* of Kittel-Friedrich.¹⁷

As a consequence of this movement, about 1910, under the influence of Georg Heinrici,¹⁸ there developed a plan to instigate a "new Wettstein", modernized in accordance with the needs of the age. It was decided that the workers would limit themselves—if this euphemism may be permitted—to materials in the Greek and Latin texts. The extremely extensive arsenal in rabbinic sources was excluded from the plan. Quite properly, for in a "one man show" that constantly compels our admiration, a parson from Frankfurt on the Oder, Paul Billerbeck, had put this material into his mighty *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch* which—whatever criticism we may make of it¹⁹—remains indispensable and impresses one the more when one considers that this was the fruit of the pastor's "spare time".

Heinrici, who himself was already elderly, enlisted the help of young collaborators. In the course of my account I pass over the organizational details.²⁰ One point, however, that is of interest for the later development must be mentioned. One can divide the existing material into two parts: a) that of Jewish-Hellenistic origin; and b) that which comes from "gentile" sources. Because the N.T. shares with the first group a common background in the O.T., which is naturally absent from the gentile authors, the relations of the N.T. to the two groups are totally different.

The plan was well received and the work begun with enthusiasm.²¹

¹⁶ Translated into English by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich under the title *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*.—Translator.

¹⁷ Here one may also refer to J. H. Moulton-G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek NT illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources* (1930), and to A. Deissmann's classical book *Licht Vom Osten*⁴ (1923).

¹⁸ On him see E. von Dobschütz in the introduction to the posthumously published book of G. Heinrici, *Die Hermes-Mystik und das NT* (Leipzig, 1918), pp. vii-xvii.

¹⁹ As, e.g., Samuel Sandmel, *Parallelomania*, *JBL*, 81 (1962), pp. 8-11.

²⁰ On this, see, among other things, the letter that Heinrici sent out to future collaborators at that time; E. von Dobschütz, *Der Plan eines neues Wettstein*, *ZNW*, 21 (1922), pp. 146-48, and the accounts of Kurt Aland and the writer in *NTS*, 2 (1956), pp. 217-21; 3 (1957), pp. 254-59. See also the recent article by Gerhard Dellling, *Zum Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*, *ZNW*, 54 (1963), pp. 1-15, which contains additional information.

²¹ There were plans in England also at this time, but they were abandoned; see A. Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 2, n. 3.

After Heinrici's death in 1915 the responsibility passed to von Dobschütz²² in Halle. Apparently things went well, for he wrote with complete confidence in 1928 that the work could be ready in a few years.²³ Yet this optimism seems not to have been justified. Promises of co-operation were indeed given but not redeemed. After 1920 the climate in the theological world changed very greatly and it was not favourable to studies of this nature. Inflation, unemployment, and by and by the nazi terror: it is not to be wondered at that the work broke down, especially since von Dobschütz died in 1934 and his successor, Hans Windisch, in 1935. As things were going, the materials of the Corpus Hellenisticum were practically orphaned. During the Second World War, Fridrichsen, who was a professor in neutral Sweden and a collaborator in this work from previous times, managed to bring over to Uppsala the notes on the gentile authors, while the Jewish-Hellenistic portion remained in Halle.

Such was the state of affairs after the Second World War: the work was divided. The organizational talent of Kurt Aland²⁴ put the train back on the tracks. Work was resumed in Halle under Delling's leadership. After Fridrichsen's death in 1953²⁵ it seemed unlikely that the work would continue in Uppsala. I had indeed been particularly fascinated by the questions which this Corpus Hellenisticum poses, and it seemed to me, too, a matter of honor for the land of Erasmus and Grotius, the land where Wettstein had happily consummated his work, to provide a strong contribution to this labor; so I exerted myself to acquire this material, the "gentile hellenistic", for Utrecht, in 1956. This was successful. Thanks to the co-operation of the Curatorium, it was possible to set

²² See his autobiography in *Die Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen* (Leipzig, 1928), 4, pp. 31-62.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

²⁴ Then professor in Halle, now in Münster of Westphalia.

²⁵ As the only result of this period one may mention a dissertation by one of Fridrichsen's students, H. Almquist, *Plutarch und das NT, ein Beitrag zum Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* (Uppsala, 1946). Along with it should be named the Mainz dissertation of H. D. Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und das NT, religionsgeschichtliche und paränetische Parallelen, ein Beitrag zum Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* (Berlin, 1961). Although the subtitles of the two books are similar, they differ greatly from one another in plan; on the difference in method see Betz, pp. xii f. On the comparison with individual authors reference may also be made to the excellent older book by A. Bonhöffer, *Epiktet und das NT* (Giessen, 1911) and to the recent study by J. N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca* (Leiden, 1962).

to work afresh, though this must necessarily still go rather slowly, since there is not yet sufficient provision for collaborators. One scientific functionary with his eye on the task is not enough! But we are now all finished with various kinds of preparatory work; the labor itself can now begin, a work in which soon, by international and interconfessional co-operation, the task laid upon us will be fulfilled.

II

This, then, was the origin and such the adventures of this foster child, the Corpus Hellenisticum for the N.T., that has now come under the aegis of our Alma Mater. The aim is to investigate everything that has been preserved from Greek and Roman antiquity as to its significance for the proper understanding of the N.T. Anyone who realizes how extensive this material is will appreciate that this is a gigantic work, especially since automation—fortunately—cannot yet be applied here.

Now that we have described the task, perhaps the question will be asked, why this labor is necessary. Does not the N.T. speak clearly enough for itself? In such a work are we not placing a dusty layer of details over a book of eternal religious value? Although I know that the N.T. possesses a special quality that has well been called “transparency”, although I can easily see the danger of listening to so many voices of scholarship that the voice of the N.T. itself cannot be heard; yet this scientific work ought to go on. Just as science cannot leave off its investigation of all possible processes of life, merely because one can live quite well without inquiring into these processes; so when it is a question of the “words of eternal life” (John vi 68) one cannot give up the work, even though without learning one may be laid hold on by eternal life. I shall try to give a threefold answer to the question why this work is necessary.

In the first place it is necessary because the N.T., for its own elucidation, poses questions to contemporary writings. If one reads the books of the N.T. and then, e.g., the religious literature that has emerged from the Gnostic library of Nag Hammadi, one is immediately struck by the fact that the books of this latter category are quite abstract, that historical and geographical indications are lacking, and that they do not go into the concrete situation of their readers. In the N.T. it is quite otherwise. Here is described the history of Jesus, who appeared in the fifteenth year of the emperor

Tiberius (Luke iii 1) and died in the time of the governor Pontius Pilate; here one reads of Paul, who traversed in his travels much of the then known world. The N.T. contains letters concerned with the specific circumstances of the people addressed, such as the commendation of a runaway slave to his master. Even a visionary book like the Revelation of John gives its consolation and outlook in the particular situations in which Christians found themselves at the end of the first century in Asia Minor. When Paul, in Acts xvii, speaks with Stoics and Epicureans, or later is haled before the governor, this calls for explanation. Where shall one find this but in contemporary sources? The N.T. arose in, and bears the marks of, other cultural and social situations than our own; if one wishes to know the power of the N.T. words, then one must know what they had to say in their time.

There is also the well-known fact that the associations of a word or a thing in one culture are different from those in another. One example out of many may illustrate this. Everyone knows the sign of the cross as a symbol of the Christian religion. Everyone who in these weeks hears once again the *Passion according to St. Matthew* knows why this is so. But what do we mean when we speak of the "Red Cross" or of a knight's cross? Is it more than a coincidental symbol, at the most, as connected with Christianity, a sign of the way in which its founder died? We know, from all kinds of evidence, that it was otherwise in the days of the N.T. The cross was not merely an especially cruel kind of capital punishment, but also one reserved for slaves and insurgents.²⁶ One who knows this can understand why Paul could write that the word of the cross, that for him is central, was nonsense to Greeks who seek wisdom (1 Cor. i 18); then one can understand the depth of the hymn in Phil. ii, where it is said that Jesus had taken upon himself the form of a slave and had become obedient "even to death, yes, the death on the cross" and realizes what is asked when Jesus is placed before one as an example. Visitors to Ravenna will perhaps recall the central mosaic consisting of a great cross surrounded by the words *salus mundi*. That is a brief summary of the message of the N.T., but he who knows the associations evoked by the cross among the contempo-

²⁶ E. Benz, *Der gekreuzigte Gerechte bei Plato, im NT, und in der alten Kirche, Akad. der Wiss. u. d. Lit. in Mainz, geistes- und sozialwiss. Kl. No. 12*, (1950), pp. 1048 ff.; J. Blinzler, *Der Prozess Jesu*³ (Regensburg, 1961), pp. 263-81.

raries of the N.T. understands what a gap is bridged here; indeed what a complete reversal is necessary if one is to proclaim that the crucified one, the slave and crushed rebel, is "the Lord", and that on him depends the salvation of the world.

The second answer to the question may be put thus: though much work has already been done on the sounding board of the N.T. to restore it and so to make its full tone audible, yet mountains of material still lie waiting to be assimilated. Wettstein, the great collector, has already told us that much still remained to be done:²⁷ the list of the authors he had consulted is imposing, but highly incomplete and arbitrary; besides, it appears again and again that he has not drawn out of his sources all that is in them. Especially in the past eighty years, through the intensive labor of classicists and theologians, a treasure of knowledge has accumulated; yet it appears again and again that the end is still far from sight. A systematic roundup is necessary. Frequently the data lie scattered here and there, and this is to be explained from the fact that all sorts of things that were known and self-evident to ancient man are lost to us. With the patience of a detective one must get together the evidence. And, thanks to the intensive snooping of archeologists and papyrologists, and through the continually renewed interpretation of long-known writers, the material grows. Oftentimes surprising results emerge when it is compared with the N.T. Here are some examples.²⁸

The first is derived from Paul's biography. In Acts xxii 3 it is said of his youth—and this is the only text that says anything explicit about it—that he was born in Tarsus but brought up and received his education in Jerusalem. The city of his birth was a center of gentile culture; Jerusalem was the Jewish city *par excellence*, and no doubt that makes an actual difference. The terms used here, "born, reared, educated", as I was able to prove ten years ago, constitute in Greek biography a fixed triad for the description of one's youth; the words, moreover, had a definite significance: birth, upbringing at home, education at school. Now one can read even in the most

²⁷ Cf. n. 6.

²⁸ The material on which the examples following here are based I published in *Tarsus of Jerusalem, de stad van Paulus' jeugd*, *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, N. R.*, deel 15, no. 2 (Amsterdam, 1952) [*E. T. Tarsus and Jerusalem* (London, 1962)], in *Sparsa Collecta* vol. I 259-320. and in *The Teaching of "Good Works" in 1 Peter*, *NTS*, 1 (1954), pp. 92-110 (In this volume p. 83-105)

recent biographies of Paul how the apostle as a small boy was deeply influenced subconsciously by the Hellenistic culture of Tarsus; shortly after his tenth year, or perhaps even later, he came to Jerusalem to acquire some rabbinical schooling, but after that the influence of his youthful impressions made themselves felt. It is thus that to a great degree his theology must be explained. This is completely contradicted by a correct explanation of the above text, for according to this Paul had lived since childhood in Jerusalem (cf. also Acts xxvi 4). All these touching stories ought to be relegated to the realm of fables. But this insight has radical consequences for our knowledge of Paul's spiritual background, his relation to "paganism", and his theology. Accurate attention to Greek linguistic usage often requires a revision of current concepts.

The second example leads us on to the terribly neglected terrain of N.T. ethics. One and the same tone sounds in Jesus' exhortation "that men say see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. v 16), in the repeated challenge of 1 Peter "to do good", and in the admonition of Paul "to do what is good in the sight of all men" (Gal. vi 10): "to do good" is indicated as the rule of life. But these "good works" are something totally different from those which stirred up such fierce strife in the age of the Reformation, even though the words are the same; these latter play no part in the process of salvation. Conscientious investigation makes it appear that the expressions here used by the N.T. must be viewed in connection with concepts of Greek and Roman social ethics, which Bolkestein, sometime professor of ancient history in this university, handled so excellently in his *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege*.²⁹ Here one enters an area where the contacts between the N.T. and the surrounding culture are extraordinarily great. These have never yet been completely investigated; they raise still further questions, such as those of the relation of this ethic to that of late Judaism, to Christianity's message of redemption, and to the later development of ethics in the church.

In the third place I should like to point out that through the collection and study of this material certain expressions of the N.T. stand out in sharper relief. Thus the authentic character of its message comes out more clearly.

²⁹ H. Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum* (Utrecht, 1939); where Bolkestein in his book comes to mention the NT, it is remarkable that he leaves this aspect of the "good works" out of consideration.

What I mean here may be clarified by a few examples. The well-known story of Heracles at the crossroad appears in Dio Chrysostom (ca. A.D. 100);³⁰ the hero must choose between the broad way to true kingship and the narrow way to tyranny. This naturally recalls the scheme of the "two ways" famous in the N.T. and in early Christian literature: those of good and evil, between which one must choose.³¹ But is it not curious that while Jesus says (Matt. vii 13 f.) that the way leading to life is narrow, while that which leads to death is broad, in Dio the situation is precisely the opposite? Here one sees a difference in outlook that is decisive for one's attitude to life. A typical difference of this sort is obvious, too, when one reads in Dio: "Just as the good physician goes to help where the sufferers are most numerous, so (according to the word of Diogenes) the wise man makes his abode where the fools are numerous".³² One is here reminded of Jesus' expression: "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick . . . I am not come to call the righteous but sinners" (Matt. ix 12 f.). For the Greek rhetorician the disease is located in foolishness; Jesus speaks of sin. Is this only a difference in words, or does it have to do with the whole of human existence? This point is interesting, too, because in later Christian literature the motif of Christ as physician frequently appears, and then the question is: on which basis do we now see him stand? In the same address the famous Cynic Diogenes is introduced as a speaker; he sketches out how noble men may have to struggle against many calamities; to undergo hunger, cold and thirst, to be subjected to scourging and burning, exile, defamation, and the like, but they meet this with disdain.³³ This description recalls the mighty conclusion of Rom. viii: "What shall separate us from the love of Christ? Oppression or tribulation or persecution or hunger or nakedness or danger or sword? . . . For I am certain nothing shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord". One and the same lot, one and the same courage. But the Cynic finds power in himself; in Paul the idea is that one's own power ultimately fails, but there exists the certainty that one remains indissolubly bound to God's love. It

³⁰ Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* i, 67 ff.

³¹ This theme is very prominent in the *Didache*; see, e.g., the commentaries of R. Knopf (1920) and J. P. Audet (1958).

³² Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* viii, 5; other parallels in Wettstein *ad loc.*; Billerbeck gives no texts from Jewish literature.

³³ Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* viii, 16 f.

would exhibit a total misunderstanding if here one were to speak of a "literary topic"; this has to do with life's most painful experiences and its deepest basis.

In thus reconstructing the sounding board of the N.T. one cannot confine himself to the contemporaries of the evangelists and apostles or to a select group, such as, e.g., the strongly religious Stoic philosophy. What is still preserved to us from antiquity exhibits, from the very nature of the tradition, a rather arbitrary character: from some areas, e.g., Egypt and Palestine, relatively much remains, but from Asia Minor relatively very little. Therefore one must draw the boundaries as widely as possible. Many writers who lived long before the N.T. age were part of the living cultural possessions of the imperial period, were read in school, and discussed by the philosophers. Various notions, e.g., about "sacred and profane", or about the meaning of predictions, remained the same for centuries in the ancient world, which, to adopt a word of van Groningen, was "in the grip of the past".³⁴ On the other hand, one must keep in sight the fact that authors who lived long after the first century have often preserved much, even having to do with the N.T. age, of which otherwise we would have no knowledge. Of course in the evaluation of data one must reckon with the fluctuations and currents in the religious, social, and political realms, but in general it must be stated that everything preserved to us from the classical world ought to be investigated for its eventual contribution to this Corpus.

Nor may the investigation be confined to certain words and their compounds, as in Kittel's *Wörterbuch*, for one must consider that identical or related ideas can be expressed by entirely different words. As an example one may mention here the beautiful idea of "the imitation of God"; this is expressed by various words such as *mimeisthai*, *zēloun*, *homoioisthai*, "to be like", etc. One meets these fundamental ideas in Hellenistic as well as in Jewish and Christian theology.

But is not one in danger of getting into a dangerous excess, a chaotic quagmire where no fence or road can be seen? It depends on how the material is ordered. Certainly in the first place one ought to aim at as great perfection as possible. Then one learns to see where generally accepted notions are present and where no parallels

³⁴ B. A. van Groningen, *In the Grip of the Past* (Leiden, 1953).

come into view. One thus establishes safeguards, too, against a one-sided search, as all too often happens when one merely proceeds from what seems foreign to us in the N.T. and then goes looking for parallels to it. This has often happened, e.g., when the mystery religions are forced to serve as a key for explanation or when, as now, for many people "Gnostic" is the universally fashionable word.

Such a task of course transcends by far the strength and the time of any one individual. As has been indicated already, wide co-operation is necessary here. But in this connection, where my purpose was to explain the necessity of this Corpus Hellenisticum, I need not dwell further on this.

III

This detailed work is necessary for a genuine understanding of the N.T. Only when one has learned to hear these words with the ears of the men of the first century will one be able to translate them for the twentieth century. Short formulae, sufficient for contemporary readers because they could understand the technical terminology, have to be decoded. A problem like that of the eating of sacrificial meat, which Paul deals with in 1 Cor. viii-x, and which does not seem timely to us, has to be appreciated if one wishes to understand what Paul's answer means. This comparison with the ancient writers helps the N.T. scholar to recognize the emotional value of the words for the earliest readers and compels us to listen ever more sharply. But does not this concentration on detail lead us into a situation which our language describes as not being able to see the wood for the trees?

We might seem to be guilty of "parallelomania", of which the president of the Society of Biblical Literature wrote last year: "We are at a junction when biblical scholarship should recognize parallelomania for the disease that it is".³⁵ Surely this is a very lingering sickness, for long ago our fellow countryman Izaäk van Dijk warned against this "restless distraction and parallelizing . . . the continual pulverizing of the past".³⁶ Are we catching this ailment through carelessness?

The danger here warned against is not imaginary. Yet I should prefer not to call it a sickness; at the worst it is an abuse of some-

³⁵ Sandmel, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

³⁶ I. van Dijk, *Verzamelde Geschriften* (Groningen, n.d.), II, col. 535 (Afscheidscollege, 1917); see also II, cols. 192 ff. (Vota Academica, 1904).

thing that is not merely allowed but actually commanded. It is definitely part of the N.T. field itself that one should be concerned with this relation to Graeco-Roman antiquity; and this exertion must amount to more than the data in a few marginal notes.

When one faces a certain resistance, which detailed investigation often evokes because one can lose sight of the great problems, it ought to be said that resistance should not be built up; instead one might speak of an interaction. To carry on scientific study is to do picky work with the vision fixed on a great problem. If one gets bogged down in detail, certainly everything comes to be pulverized and only a handful of dust is one's grasp; while, on the other hand, if one plays only with great problems, the result turns out to be high-sounding slogans with no more value than a soap bubble. There must be an interaction between examination of detail and the total picture. Dozens of times one can point to agreements between the Gospel of John and Philo or the mysticism of the Hermetica, but at the same time one should never forget that John's purpose, to emphasize that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah (John xx 31), finds no place anywhere, nor can one find it, in Philo or the Hermetica; these agreements had better be discounted when one draws a picture of John.

After this detailed work on the Corpus Hellenisticum, what great problem remains? One word suffices to answer the question: the hellenization of Christianity. Yet this answer requires some explanation.

Simply, and yet precisely, this problem faces us in a passage in the Gospel of John. Within the compass of a few verses three words, "rabbi", "Messias", and "Cephas", are prefixed with the apposition "which translated means", and then follows the Greek word that serves to translate.³⁷ Three times then, a word is translated into Greek out of the Palestinian vernacular. Several questions arise from this. Why was this translation necessary? Is not something going to be lost by this translation, since a Jewish rabbi is to some degree different from a Greek teacher? And, while the rendering of *Christos* (anointed) for *Messiah* may be literal, it does not evoke the hope of a king-liberator which made Jewish hearts thrill; in Greek religion there was no such figure.

³⁷ John i 38: "they said to him, Rabbi, which translated means Teacher"; i 41, "we have found the Messiah, which means Christos"; i 42, "you shall be called Cephas, which means Petros".

Why was this translation necessary? The movement aroused in Palestine by the rabbi of Nazareth did not fall to pieces after his death on the cross; it did not consolidate itself into a withdrawn group like the Qumran community; it had gone into the world and soon burst the bounds of Palestine. The process was achieved quietly; yet it was a fact of importance for world history, whose consequences we see in the life of all of us. As early as twenty-five years after Jesus' departure there were communities in all the important centers of the Roman empire, bound together by their faith in Jesus Christ as Lord, him who had been crucified and was risen.

This course from Jerusalem to Antioch, Asia Minor, and beyond, was more than a mere crossing of boundaries. The transition implied a linguistic change, for save for a few cultic terms such as *Amen* and *Hallelujah* the preaching was in Greek, the language that replaced the Aramaic of the Palestinian churches. The tongues we mention are completely different in vocabulary, forms, and syntax. Every translator knows well how much can fall between the quay and the ship. But the transition went still further: was it a change-over in forms of thought? This is stated emphatically by the Norwegian scholar Boman in his book *Das hebräische Denken im Vergleich mit dem griechischen*,³⁸ but combatted very emphatically by Barr.³⁹ This aspect of the work is highly important, and it is desirable to continue the investigation along these lines; yet in this way the transition has not yet been precisely defined, for the division was deeper and broader than a cleavage of language.

Early Christianity came from a tiny land where the confession of one God, whose will and promises had been given in the Law and the Prophets, was dominant, and into a world where many gods in motley variety were worshiped and laws other than Yahweh's were binding. One can also see the difference in this way: for the Jews there was a valid contrast between Jew and gentile, and this was defined religiously; while, for the Greeks, the distinction was between Hellenes and barbarians, and this was defined by culture.⁴⁰ The history and the expectation of this small nation, for which the temple in Jerusalem was the center of the world, differed from the cultural ideals that radiated from Athens and from the world

³⁸ Rev. Engl. ed., *Hebrew Thought compared with Greek* (London, 1960).

³⁹ J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford, 1961).

⁴⁰ Cf. J. Jüthner, *Hellenen und Barbaren* (Vienna, 1922).

dominion to which Rome was conscious of being called. Religiously seen, the Roman empire was no vacuum but a melting pot in which mystery religions from Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor mingled with the old religions of the Greeks and Romans, and in which the Judaism of the diaspora had its place.

This transition from the Jewish to the gentile world signifies a total change of environment, in which the message of Jesus Christ sought to make itself intelligible; upon which it reacted; in which it stationed its followers. The connection with its land of origin was never broken: the gospels, even in their Greek form, again and again evoke memories of it; Paul never denies the bond with his people or his rabbinical education. Yet the scenery is different. Thus in studying the N.T. one must look continually in two directions and reckon with both situations. The oldest Christian preaching, as it is preserved in the N.T., speaks the Greek language and is written in a Hellenistic environment. Does not this transition also mean that the gospel of Jesus has been changed in character?

In the course of historical investigation of Christianity in its most ancient developments, much has been said about hellenization,⁴¹ and the concept frequently carries the flavor of "degeneration" and "apostasy". We can leave out of account those hellenizing processes that took place in the second or the fourth century. But since the beginning of this century this process of development has been seen at work within the N.T. as well. A Jewish scholar has expressed it briefly and well: "with its spreading to the Ephesians, Thessalonians and Corinthians, so many alien ideas changed the original kernel".⁴² In this men's gaze was fixed not merely on the use that Paul, e.g., makes of Greek style forms or figurative language, but also on his ideas about baptism and the Lord's supper, about his relation to Christ Jesus. Do not the gospels portray Jesus as a Hellenistic *theios anēr*, or godlike man, instead of the Jewish Messiah? In the so-called Pastoral Epistles there has been pointed out the use of various terms such as "Savior", *epiphaneia*, and "godliness", which dominate the linguistic usage and are all derived from Hellenistic religious terminology; they have been counted as "foreign in-

⁴¹ The story of this phenomenon is described by W. Glawe, *Die Hellenisierung in der Geschichte der Theologie von Luther bis auf die Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1912). It would be worth while to continue this investigation, especially because in my opinion in the last half century the matter has been too little discussed historically and theologically.

⁴² E. Werner, *The Sacred Bridge* (London, 1959), p. xiii.

fluences"; and it has been found that the moral prescriptions correspond completely to popular Greek morality and are hardly specifically "Christian". Is not the designation "Son of God" applied to Jesus a typical case of hellenizing, as we so often hear emphasized from the Jewish side? This is only a small handful of the many cases where this hellenization is thought to be at work.

This capital problem for N.T. scholarship is the great task for which the Corpus Hellenisticum must provide the detailed work. It becomes ever more evident that the answer to the question, whether the N.T. writers have accommodated their preaching to their environment and transformed it, whether the hellenization went deep or remained only superficial, has far-reaching significance for the understanding of the N.T.. Here one must not rest content with a few general impressions and selected instances; the material needs to be investigated in its full breadth, where both agreements and differences come into play.

Without attempting now to grasp the eventful answer to this question, I should like, finally, to indicate in which direction, in my opinion, the answer lies.

First, then, it should be observed that the first Christian preachers who sought to make a transition did not regard this as a burden. For the Jews, life among the gentiles was a curse and the ideal was return to the Holy Land. Christians knew of a commission to make disciples of Jesus from all nations, to bring the gospel "to the uttermost parts of the earth",⁴³ for God loved the world (John iii 16); and therefore Paul considered himself a debtor to both Jews and Greeks. There had been strife in the church in the first decades over various matters, e.g., the admission of "gentiles" into the Christian community, but never over the question whether the Christian message could be translated into Greek; on the contrary, the Pentecost story (Acts ii) makes it clear that everyone might hear it in his own tongue. There was obviously no problem for the most ancient Christians; therefore we ought not to exaggerate it.

In the second place, one should be on his guard against the current unconscious association of the ideas of "hellenizing" and "falsifying". One ought to ask whether a translation is *sachgemäß*. When, as, e.g., in Tit. iii 4, the *philanthropia* of God is mentioned, it is important to know that this term appears in the religious terminology

⁴³ Cf. Matt. xxviii 19 ff.; Acts i 8.

of the imperial period, e.g., as a virtue of a ruler; and it is necessary to gauge the emotional richness of this word, for one ought not to lose sight of the fact that we find here a tellingly accurate expression for that love of God, that pity for humanity, to which the whole N.T. witnesses. It is not origin, but usage in the service of the gospel, that is decisive. Paul speaks of his striving to "bring every thought as captive under obedience to Christ" (2 Cor. x 5). The forms of the age are adopted in order to express the wonder that men had felt at Jesus' appearing. My Leiden colleague Sevenster has made it convincingly clear how, throughout the entire N.T., amid the diversity of titles and images, a single fundamental design can be found.⁴⁴ And this is true also in regard to other essential data. One may indeed ascribe to the first Christians, who knew thoroughly what heathendom was, enough spiritual discrimination to decide what was acceptable and what was not.

This does not mean that I am toying with the problem, but only that I want to bring it back to its actual proportions. The gospel of the N.T. is not a lesson embodied in a pamphlet—in that case translation might indeed become falsification—but a witness to the unique person of Jesus, to the action of God in this individual man.

The books of the N.T. are collected under a title that properly means "the New Covenant".⁴⁵ This, that is new and enduring, has been bestowed on the world in the appearing of Jesus: a new relation to God, a new relationship among men; a new life, and a new expectation. This new thing Jesus has brought in his preaching and has inaugurated in his death and resurrection. This new thing is bestowed on men in faith. This new thing bridges the gulf between Jew and Greek, for according to Paul's word there is no distinction between the two, neither in their guilt toward God nor in the forgiveness that they have received from him.⁴⁶ In a wealth of variations the witness is that in Christ the old has passed away and the new has come. This is proclaimed in the language of the world in which this message has begun to do its work, in which it has revealed its transforming power.

The labor on behalf of the Corpus Hellenisticum to the N.T., con-

⁴⁴ G. Sevenster, *De Christologie van het NT*² (Amsterdam, 1948).

⁴⁵ I am very glad to recall here the important address that D. Plooi made at his installation in Utrecht on October 3, 1932: *Novum Testamentum Regnum aeternum* (Amsterdam, 1932).

⁴⁶ Cf. Rom iii 22; x 12.

cerning which I have had the privilege of speaking to you this afternoon, is being carried out and it is necessary in order to make clear the authentic character of the New Covenant, that we humans, who count our years one by one, may understand the voice of Him who has the words of eternal life.

GENERALIA

CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS IN NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP *

In the circle of the Pythagorean philosophers the advice was given to avoid the trodden paths.¹ In the study of the New Testament it seems almost impossible to follow this counsel. So many men have pored over this slim volume in the course of the centuries; so many, whether scholars or laymen, have tried to grasp its meaning, that the entire area seems to have been trodden flat, even ploughed up. Yet generation after generation still desires to hear the Word of God in those old words, and, like the shepherds in the Christmas story, wishes "to see that word that has happened" (Lk. ii 15). Can anyone living nowadays do anything but pursue a trodden path, discuss and repeat what others have said before him?

The premise of the entire New Testament is that God has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ; that, as St John so movingly put it, "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us" (i 14). We can accept this together with the Christian Church, or we can reject it as an unjustified pretension. In either case we are dealing with a piece of human history, recounted at a certain time, in a certain form, and in certain words. The New Testament does not offer a system of truths—which could in itself again be the object of interpretation—but tells of a man and his work among men. Insofar as this is a historical fact which took place in the area stretching from Palestine to Spain under the Roman emperors from Augustus to Domitian, it is the object of scholarly investigation. N.T. scholarship does its best to understand its object and to see what has been said and professed by, and about, Jesus Christ. It can seek the answer to Jesus' question "Who do men say that I am?", but should be aware that this is not the ultimate and the most profound question. The ultimate question is "Who do you say that I am?" No science can provide an answer to that: the answer is either mumbled silently, or shouted exultantly, by faith. But in order to get to faith we need to understand history, and therefore require the aid of scholarship.

* First appeared as "Hedendaagse problemen in de Nieuw-testamentische wetenschap". Nijkerk 1947 (inaugural lecture, February 17, 1947).

¹ In Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber* I, ed. Cohn-Wendland VI, p.1.

In the continual mutation of everything on earth there is not a single object of scientific research which remains a haven of immutability. To illustrate this further in the present company would be to send owls to Athens. Since "our knowledge is imperfect" no domain of science can provide an image of permanence. As far as ancient history is concerned, Professor Thiel proved this clearly to be the case from this same desk last year. We can talk of growth, improvement, progress, but what remains certain is that no department of scholarship will always be constant. Not even that of the N.T. As in other domains, here too the human mind is driven on to, or attracted by, continuous research. If the path seems to be trodden flat at first sight, new ground appears again and again to be lying fallow on closer inspection.

Thus the question is understandable and justifiable: what is the state of affairs within this domain of research? Be it, therefore, permitted to me to speak to you now about *Contemporary Problems in New Testament Scholarship*.

The alterations which occur in every area of scholarship are determined, as far as I can see, by three factors: *the discovery of new data* either leads to previously unknown questions or compels us to face old problems anew; *the fresh interpretation of material already familiar to us* brings to light hitherto unseen facts and problems; *practical life* presents difficulties whose solution is expected to come from scholars. I do not mean to say, of course, that all three factors always appear together and are all equally stimulating at the same time. Yet, in principle, they are always present. Consequently we want to ask ourselves how these influences affect our subject at the moment.

1. If we acquaint ourselves with the state of New Testament research in the first twenty-five years of this century by reading the extensive survey produced by Maurice Jones in 1934, or the address given by my predecessor in 1929 at the Utrechtsche Predikantenvergadering,² we will see that the territory was dominated by the discovery of the importance of Hellenistic Greek where the language of the N.T. was concerned, and by the questions raised by so-called *Religionsgeschichte*. I wish to be permitted to use this technical term in a foreign language since—possibly because of a

² M. Jones, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*³, London 1934; A. M. Brouwer, *Hedendaagsche Vragen aangaande het Nieuwe Testament* in: *Wat is ons de Bijbel*, Zeist 1929, p. 62-102.

latent antisemitism—it has been applied to religions from every country, even those of the Bushmen and the Mexicans, and has been used to explain all the data in the New Testament with the exception of Judaism! Only at the beginning of this century did the religion of the Roman imperial period become known to us in all its curiously syncretistic character. The religions of ancient Greece and Rome appeared to be imbued with the religions of the ancient East. Salvation was literally sought in the customs and ideas of Egypt, Asia Minor, Syria and Persia. The names of Dieterich, Cumont, Wendland and Reitzenstein are representative of a large group of scholars who assembled a wealth of information about the religious life of the Roman empire.

Scholars' attention was consequently drawn to similar words and customs in primitive Christianity. Subtle arguments were used to reveal countless connections. "Christianity, a syncretistic religion", a hotchpotch of ideas from all sorts of other religions—this was the slogan launched by Gunkel.³ It was particularly the sacraments of Baptism and Communion and the views about the end of the world—so-called apocalypticism—which provided a fertile field of research. There was an unbridgeable abyss between the simple gospel as Jesus had preached it in the Sermon on the Mount and the parables, and the Christianity of the "Kultheros" Jesus Christ. The Gospel of St John—regarded with suspicion since the earliest times—was said to be pure Hellenism, and St Paul was conceived as the impossible Rabbi who had transformed the faith of Jesus into a mystery religion, if not the *Gemeindetheologie* of Antioch and elsewhere was put into the field as a hardly determinable, but very determinant factor.

An often heated discussion developed around these questions. Now, however, the din has died down. This was partly for internal reasons: it appeared that analogies had often been mistaken for dependences; that chronological difficulties had arisen; and above all that ideas had been attributed to a man like St Paul which, on closer inspection, turned out not to be his. Just as someone wittily said about Reitzenstein: he was pelted with parallels from Hellenistic literature before he even had a chance to speak.⁴ Furthermore it appeared, in the long run, that it was not so easy to isolate the "pure gospel" of Jesus.

³ H. Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, Göttingen 1903, p. 95.

⁴ A. Schweitzer, *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, Tübingen 1930, p. 28.

The great turning point occurred, however, when new data were brought into play. Once "again" scholars developed an eye for the significance of later Judaism—and not primarily in its Hellenistic and syncretistic form (Bousset),⁵ but in the normative doctrine of the Rabbis as it survived in legal tractates, the Talmudim, and sermons, the Midrashim, which, though of a later period, were undoubtedly largely traditional. This was accompanied by a better study of Aramaic, the colloquial language in Palestine during the N.T. period, which often cast a surprising light on all sorts of terms.

Our knowledge of the Rabbinic works has a curious history. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries various scholars, such as Lightfoot and Wettstein, had already used Rabbinical writings to elucidate the N.T. Later scholars were aware of this. They plundered Lightfoot and his companions mercilessly, but went no further than this relatively harmless crime. The independent knowledge of their sources was lost. These were said to be inaccessible and were relinquished for what they were—the property of the Jews. At the same time a remarkable enthusiasm developed for digging up from the most obscure corners ancient Jewish apocalypses and other apocrypha which had been rejected by the Rabbis, but preserved by the Christians. These could be fitted into the religious historical framework of the problems better than the Rabbinic arguments, which were so difficult to follow. A man like Schlatter, who did not shrink from the Rabbinic works, stood outside the "zünftige Wissenschaft" and consequently was not allowed to get a word in. The revolution which took place in this domain is strikingly indicated by the fact that, when Schlatter's great commentaries appeared at the end of his life, in about 1930, they attracted a good deal of attention and were eagerly consulted, while his booklet on the Gospel of St John, which appeared in 1902 with some extremely important material, was dismissed out of hand. As early as 1898, in his *Worte Jesu* ⁶ in which he elucidated numerous concepts from the first three gospels, such as the "Kingdom of God", Dalman had shown what these sources could mean to the N.T. scholar. Here in Holland Oort worked along similar

⁵ W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*³, Tübingen 1926.

⁶ G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache erörtert*, Leipzig ¹1898, ²1930.

lines; in Germany Fiebig showed an interest in the same field, but on the whole their voices were like that of John the Baptist, crying in the wilderness. In his monumental, all but all-embracing *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, Schürer only made a very limited use of these writings.⁷

The great revolution took place in the twenties and, as so often happens, it was brought about by various scholars who had been working independently of one another. Billerbeck published his life's work in five large volumes (Strack's name was only connected with it *pro forma*)—a "corpus rabbinicum" on the entire N.T., containing almost everything even remotely connected with a given theme, and immensely instructive for both similarities and differences between Judaism and Christianity. It was a collection of loose quotations and treatises, grouped round the N.T. At the same time the American religious historian, G. F. Moore, published the fruit of years of study in this domain—in which Judaism itself decided what was important and determined the line of discussion. Jeremias produced a history of *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, with emphasis on the sociological structure, and Gerhard Kittel clearly illustrated the significance of the work in a series of papers, *Probleme des Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*.⁸ Since then the doors to this domain, the territory to which the N.T. points on almost every page, have been wide open. No serious study of primitive Christianity is possible any more without a knowledge of later Judaism, its language, history and patterns of thought. For Jesus Christ was not descended from Romulus, Theseus, the Achaemenids or the Ptolemies, but from Abraham. Jesus and St Paul were not carried round the hearth after their birth, but circumcised on the eighth day, and they remained well aware of this.

The significance of this research for the first three gospels, the Synoptic Gospels, is immediately evident, for they are set entirely in Palestine. But even where St Paul and St John are concerned, the situation suddenly appears in a different light. Since these are

⁷ E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*³⁻⁴, Leipzig 1901-1909, 3 vols.

⁸ H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1922-1928, 4 vols.; G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (Cambridge (Mass.), 1927-1930, 3 vols.; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, Leipzig 1923-1937, 4 vols.; G. Kittel, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, Stuttgart 1926.

"delicate points", it is precisely here that the change must be demonstrated.

In the case of St Paul we see from the jumps—the transitions and the associations—in his epistles, which are not determined logically but depend on various meanings of the same Aramaic word, that, even if he did not write in Aramaic, he certainly thought in it, and also prayed in it: "Abba".⁹ The material on which his notions were based must therefore be elucidated from this angle, and not primarily in the light of Greek terminology. In his method, as Bonsirven demonstrated with plenty of evidence in his exhaustive study on *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne*,¹⁰ St Paul was a Rabbi, even if it was applied to a different subject when he became a Christian. The same can also be seen where his "doctrine" is concerned. A single example should suffice to clarify this. The Swedish scholar Percy took the German Käsemann to task in his recent study on the much-discussed problem of the authenticity of Ephesians and Colossians, an important question since these epistles differ from the others in all sorts of respects: according to whether they are genuine or not we would get a very different picture of St Paul's theology. Käsemann had interpreted the doctrine of redemption as it is expressed in these letters entirely in the light of Gnosticism—a fairly vague notion which has already sowed havoc in N.T. scholarship, but which may be defined as a syncretistic doctrine of Salvation. Percy observed that we do indeed find a discussion of the redemption from this world, which has already taken place, and of being transposed to another world, in both St Paul and the Gnostics, but that the antithesis in the Gnostics is between two substances, spirit and matter, while the background of St Paul is to be found in the Jewish antithesis of the two "aeons", this world and the next: the new aeon in Christ Resurrected has already become a reality for the faithful.¹¹

A Hellenistic or a Jewish background to St Paul? I should also cite another example to show that, as against many opinions, we must choose the second alternative. It does not concern the intricate

⁹ Cf. my article *Aramaisms in Paul* in: *Sparsa Collecta*, I, Leiden, 1973, p. 129-143.

¹⁰ J. Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne*, Paris, 1940. See also by the same author: *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ, sa théologie*, Paris 1935, 2 vols.

¹¹ E. Percy, *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, Lund 1946, p. 112-113.

territory of theological speculation: it concerns a practical matter. The question is this: why do men not keep their heads covered at religious services, while women do? We consider this a matter of no importance, for which we do not need to account. If we observe this custom we do so because we think that respect and decorum demand it of us, for we never enter a room with something on our heads. St Paul discusses the matter in 1 Cor. xi 2 ff. For him this was far from being a *quantité négligeable*, for he speaks of a "tradition" which he delivered to the Corinthians on this point, and puts the matter on the same level as his instructions about Communion (xi 23) and Christ's death and resurrection, the very essence of his preaching (xv 3). It is therefore an extremely important point of almost dogmatic interest. He adds, moreover, that whoever keeps his head covered is putting Christ, his true head, to shame. It is almost blasphemy. In his authoritative commentary, however, Lietzmann observes here: "we cannot see why Paul does not omit verse 3 as well as the forced play on words and simply appeal to the prevailing usage". For one can prove from a passage in Plutarch that it was quite customary for men in Greece to keep their heads bare.¹² But St Paul was fool enough *not* to refer to the custom—and besides, what strong expressions he uses! So there must be more to it. The Jews covered themselves at their religious services (2 Cor. iii 15 ff.), and this was taken as a sign of reverence. What then? Aramaic linguistic usage comes to our assistance. For in Aramaic we get the expression "to uncover the head" in the sense of "to be free". In the Targum, for example, we read that the Israelites departed from Egypt with bared heads, where the O.T. reads "with a raised hand", R.S.V.: "defiantly". To bare the head is therefore a sign of freedom, of that freedom with which Christ set us free (Gal. v 1). The Jews, who still cover themselves, live in bondage (see 2 Cor. iii 17, the famous words "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom"). To prophesy with covered head therefore means to fall back into bondage. That is why St Paul is so savage about it, and why it is a part of his preaching about Christ—it can only be understood against a Jewish background,¹³ not against a Hellenistic one.

¹² H. Lietzmann, *An die Korinther*³ in: *Handbuch zum N.T.*, Tübingen 1931, *ad loc.*; cf. also A. van Veldhuizen, *Paulus' Brieven aan de Korinthiërs*² in: *Tekst en Uitleg*, Groningen-The Hague 1922, *ad loc.* "connection with Greek customs".

¹³ I will be going into this in greater detail in a study entitled *The Semitic*

With reference to St John, Howard wrote, after an extensive survey of the literature in 1931: "There are signs that the next important concentration of effort will be to work out the connexion between the teaching of Jesus as given in this Gospel and the more mystical element in early Jewish religious thought"—and he did not have Philo in mind.¹⁴ In our country de Zwaan tried to prove that St John was translated from the Aramaic, just as Burney and Torrey, albeit on other grounds, had claimed before him.¹⁵ Schlatter and Odeberg endeavoured, each in his own way, to elucidate this gospel in the light of Jewish thought patterns.¹⁶ Indicative in this respect is the present treatment of the notorious Logos problem in chap. I. This notion was once always taken as proof of the fact that here Greek philosophical terminology was being used. Billerbeck showed, however, that everything said here about the Logos—in a way unacceptable to the Greeks, to be sure,—would have applied to the Mosaic Law for the Jews. The *term* might be Greek, but the *content* is entirely Jewish. The contrast between the Law of Moses and Christ is clearly expressed in i 17: "The law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ".¹⁷ A detailed investigation of the relationship between St John and the Synoptic Gospels also shows that they are closer to each other than had hitherto been thought. It is particularly important to keep in mind that St John thinks "concentrically".

There is another area, too, in which attitudes to St John are changing: the area of eschatology, i.e. the doctrine of final things. There used to be a tendency to see a radical divergence on this point from the first three gospels: St John was supposed to have spiritualised matters in a mystical sense. Now, however, scholars have developed an ear for the fact that this evangelist is just as eschatological as the others, and can only be understood from

Background of PARRHESIA in the New Testament (in this volume p. 290-306, ed.).

¹⁴ W. F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, London 1931, p. 172.

¹⁵ J. de Zwaan, *John wrote in Aramaic* in: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 1938 p. 155-171; C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford 1922; C. C. Torrey, *Our Translated Gospels*, New York 1936.

¹⁶ A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes*, Stuttgart 1930; H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, Uppsala-Stockholm 1929.

¹⁷ See G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, Stuttgart 1942, vol. IV, s.v. and W. F. Howard, *Christianity according to St John*, London 1943, ch. 2.

Jewish premises.¹⁸ In this connection I would like to refer to a remarkable feature which is usually overlooked. In Jn. xi 50 the high priest says: "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish". The evangelist adds that this is a prophecy that Jesus will die for the nation, and not only for the nation (of the Jews), "but to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad" (vs. 52). This, then, is a pure elucidation by the evangelist. How can it be explained? In his commentary Bultmann spoke of a gathering together of the sparks of lights from the Gnostic doctrine of redemption. But does anything point to this? Surprisingly enough not a single expositor has taken the trouble to look around in the field of Jewish eschatology. There we find a firmly established tradition, already existing in the O.T., according to which, in the time of salvation, all the Jews who live in the dispersion i.e. exile, and therefore in pagan territory with all its impurities, will return once more to the Holy Land and the Holy Nation. Thus the singer in the Psalms of Solomon viii 34 prayed: "collect the dispersion of Israel", and in a well-known prayer from the synagogue we hear: "gather the scattered from the four corners of the earth". I would be testing your patience too much if I were to quote further passages which all show that this is a typical Jewish-Messianic idea.¹⁹ Where this is expressed so genuinely, and appears to be so authentic a property of the evangelist who left such a strong mark on the book, we must be cautious about Hellenism, and try, rather, to find an explanation in the Jewish background.

Is Christianity a variant of the pagan religious currents in the Roman empire or can it only be understood against the background of later Judaism, as we know it from the Talmud and the Targum, the apocalypses and the Septuagint? For all their similarity there is a striking difference between these two. The last solution must be preferred, however. That "salvation is from the Jews" (Jn iv 22) has been confirmed by historical research. This does not mean that we should reject the material which *Religionsgeschichte* has made familiar to us, but that we should reject several of its fundamental conclusions. We cannot deny that it has made contributions of incalculable value to our knowledge of the N.T.

¹⁸ Cf. Howard, *Christianity*, ch. 5.

¹⁹ Numerous passages in P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, Tübingen 1934, p. 345-346.

world and the history of the primitive church. It would be folly not to take this seriously into consideration. But the material is not *fundamental* to our understanding of the N.T. Furthermore, although there are undoubted parallels, and Judaism was unquestionably influenced by its pagan surroundings in the elaboration of its ideas, we must not forget that Judaism and paganism had held certain concepts in common for many centuries—concepts such as cleanness and uncleanness, sacrifice, etc. In the Greek translation of the O.T. certain Greek words were marked with a “sacred” significance, e.g. *agapè* = love; *ekklèsia* = God’s people. When applied in the N.T., therefore, these same words do not have an essentially Greek meaning.

It is not in the light of the piety of the Hellenistic mysteries, but in the light of Palestinian Judaism that the significance of the proclamation of Jesus the “Anointed One” should be understood—the newly-discovered material has taught us this much. G. Kittel’s voluminous dictionary, in which both Jewish and Greek usage are equally clearly represented, gives an excellent idea of the state of the problem today. The great question of the so-called Hellenisation of Christianity now presents itself to us in a different manner: it is still an important question, but it cannot be answered as glibly and one-sidedly as people thought in the past. This is an insight of profound significance, even for modern history of dogma.

2. Let us now turn to the second factor: the ever more intensive study of the material already known to us. In the N.T. we have a collection of documents from primitive Christianity, produced by the pens of at least nine authors, spread over a period of a mere fifty years. We consequently know far more about the development and the first years of this religion than we do about any other. But between the life of Jesus and the earliest gospel known to us there are still about thirty years. All sorts of items have been lost from the correspondence of St Paul, such as an epistle to Laodicea and letters to and from Corinth. In the Acts of the Apostles we have a relatively large amount of information about St Paul’s ministry, but what were the others preaching? Is it possible to get behind the writings at our disposal? Is it possible to establish which influences the tradition concerning Christ underwent before it was deposited in the gospels, with their curious similarities and differences? How is it, to suggest a further question, that many of the

exhortations we find in St Paul's epistles bear a resemblance to the "lists of sins" in pagan ethics? What is the connection between Jesus and St Paul, where the difference in terminology is so evident? Did actually Jesus give way to St Paul or is the apostle indeed the "slave of Jesus Christ"? Here we have a list of questions which could easily be increased tenfold and which have occupied N.T. scholarship for more than a century without any generally accepted conclusions having yet been reached. In this respect, too, there has been a change, whereby scholars have directed their attention principally to the common property, the "traditional material". This, however, is not to be found in new data but only by using the N.T. writings which have lain before us for centuries.

If we want to see something of this change we would do well not to go into the intricate questions raised by so-called *Formgeschichte* in connection with the Synoptic Gospels. It is striking, however, that this method should have had so great a success in England in recent years. Vincent Taylor gave a superb survey in which, with cogent arguments, he exposed its significance and combated the idea that "Form Criticism" necessarily leads to the type of scepticism about Jesus' life and doctrine which we find in Bultmann.²⁰ This method was applied in a particularly interesting way in a very suggestive book which is little known in Holland—T. W. Manson's *The Teaching of Jesus*. Not only does the author differentiate between the four sources which, according to Streeter, lie behind our gospels, but he also studies Jesus' use of words in his conversations with His disciples, the public and the Pharisees respectively. On the basis of this study he reached the interesting conclusion that Jesus seldom, or never, spoke of God directly as Father, except to His disciples, and that He first did this after the profession of Peter (Mk viii 27 ff.).²¹ We immediately realise, especially if we think of the manner in which someone like Von Harnack placed the Fatherhood of God in the centre of the Gospel, that such an observation was of far-reaching significance. I can only refer in passing to Manson's remarkable and original interpretation of the famous title "Son of Man", which he equated, on the basis of Daniel vii, with the Holy Nation, the "rest" who found

²⁰ V. Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*², London 1935, p. vi.

²¹ T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus, Studies of its Form and Content*², Cambridge 1935, p. 98.

their highest embodiment in Jesus.²² It would thus designate a "corporate personality", a term which was, I believe, first used by the English O.T. scholar Wheeler Robinson²³ to describe a remarkable Eastern concept. One can, for example, designate both the patriarch and the Jewish people with the name Israel, and all sorts of O.T. texts where Jacob is mentioned were easily interpreted as referring to his posterity. If we were to accept this interpretation given by Manson we would see how St Paul could refer to the church as the body of Christ; how he could speak of being buried with Christ in His death (Rom. vi) and use other opaque expressions which are not made any clearer by whispering the word "mystical". The link between Jesus and St Paul, which, in the view of many N.T. scholars of thirty years ago, was almost absent, would then seem far closer than anyone had supposed.

We can also see this attempt to get behind the sources in a different domain: in the question of the relationship between 1 Peter and St Paul. In the earlier critical school it was almost a dogma that 1 Peter had nothing to do with the apostle of that name and was written by a pupil of St Paul who had diluted the great ideas of the Apostle of the Gentiles into an ethical doctrine. In 1931 Jülicher could still speak of an "Abklatsch paulinischer Briefe".²⁴ Thereupon scholars decided on the late dating of 1 Peter. When we look at the passages which are supposed to show dependence, however, we do not find a single direct quotation, but a method of establishing "similarities" in use amongst classical scholars forty years ago, but which has rightly been given up since. By handling any two texts chosen at random in this way, it is possible to construct a relation of dependence. Furthermore the late dating of 1 Peter cannot be defended; this epistle must have been written before 70.²⁵ In his excellent commentary which appeared last year Selwyn dealt extensively with this relationship: he devoted over a fifth of the 500 pages of his work to it. He pleaded for a "synoptic study" of the epistles and believed, on the basis of tabular surveys, that he could prove that the N.T. epistles had a common basis of catechetic

²² T. W. Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 277 ff.

²³ Cf. Wheeler Robinson, *Record and Revelation*, Oxford 1938, p. 240.

²⁴ A. Jülicher-E. Fascher, *Einleitung in das N.T.*, Tübingen 1931, p. 196.

²⁵ So G. Kittel, V. Taylor, W. Michaelis, E. G. Selwyn. I reached the same conclusion myself, although I adopted a different approach in: *The Redemption in 1 Peter I 18-19 and the Problems of the First Letter of Peter*, (in this volume, p. 3-82, ed.).

and liturgical sources. The ground had been laid for his conclusions by Carrington in his *Primitive Christian Catechism* ²⁶ of 1940, in which he established a link with Baptism and referred above all to the "law of holiness" in Lev. xix as a common basis. It is to be regretted that Carrington's appointment as bishop of Quebec forced him to draft his study so sketchily: his work is thus more a collection of fruitful suggestions than a well-argued demonstration. Selwyn embroidered still further on the same canvas and perceived, in addition to a catechesis about "persecution", two more baptismal catecheses: B¹ before St Paul's second mission; B² dating from the years 50-55. In doing this Selwyn brought a very interesting topic into discussion. He showed that the significance of the epistle does not reside primarily in hypothetical earlier writings, but in the fact that 1 Peter must be appreciated as a an independent testimony alongside St Paul, and not regarded as a mimicry. He believed that it is thereby possible to learn about a common fund of ideas, whether this was actually expressed in writing or not.

This is not the place in which to indulge in an extensive criticism. I shall just make a couple of remarks. It is obvious that Selwyn only took the ethical, and not the dogmatic, material into consideration, and it is precisely in the latter case that we find interesting parallels. Like Carrington, he failed to consider the information about the proselytes in Jewish literature, and particularly in the work of Philo. One example will serve to show the significance of this literature: Selwyn discusses extensively the term "children of light", applied to the newly baptized. The transition from darkness to light, from paganism to Christianity, can also be found in Philo in a Jewish context, and St Paul includes among the titles of honour on which the Jews prided themselves before the pagans "a light to those who are in darkness" (Rom. ii 19). The comparison has to be extended still further. The ethics of Hellenistic Judaism should also be studied in connection with Stoic material, as Dibelius started to do in his commentary on James (1921). But we should not work disjointedly, with loose verses and units: we should keep an eye on the whole. In my view this will bear good fruit. The work of A. Seeberg who, in his *Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, also traced traditional material at the beginning of this century, will at last come into its own. Since his work did not

²⁶ Ph. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism*, Cambridge 1940; E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St Peter*, London 1946.

suit the hypotheses in fashion at the time it was virtually killed by silence. But surely there is some satisfaction in this life in saying after their death that people were right?

The highly successful work of the Cambridge N.T. scholar C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, carries us to an area which has again become a centre of attention through a renewed study of old material. I mean eschatology, not as the last chapter of dogma, but as an overall elucidation of primitive Christianity. Dodd starts with the common tradition. He asks the question: what should we understand by the "preaching" (the kerygma) to which St Paul refers with the words: "it pleased God through the folly of what we preach to save those who believe" (1 Cor. i 21). He reconstructs this on the basis of 1 Cor. xv 3 ff. In this passage, which had already been put to a similar purpose earlier, we read: "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day, etc.". Here, then, we have traditional material. Dodd compares this with St Peter's utterances in Acts which, judging from the Aramaisms, rest on sound tradition. Behind this address we find the same schema. It all proclaims that God's great work has been accomplished through Jesus Christ. Dodd makes a link with the text "the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Mt. xii 28, Lk. xi 20); therefore, the awaited eschatological Kingdom is here; the return, which would take place soon, was to complete Christ's work. "They proclaimed it not so much as a future event for which men should prepare by repentance, but rather as the impending corroboration of a present fact: the new age is already here".²⁷ This is the famous concept of "realized eschatology": there is no coming of the Son of Man after the one in Galilee and Jerusalem.²⁸ Since this return did not occur, men later turned to the schemata of Jewish apocalypticism and awaited a second coming (futuristic utterances). The structure of the gospels shows the influence of the ancient kerygma, but they have been adapted more or less to the altered circumstances. In his book on the parables Dodd applied these ideas to that theme most skilfully. That is why my predecessor discussed Dodd's hypothesis in his last work on the same subject

²⁷ C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*², London 1944, p. 33.

²⁸ C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*³, London 1936, p. 108.

and, in my opinion very rightly, attacked it. For that futuristic element cannot be eliminated.²⁹ Although I must refrain from treating in greater detail the discussion roused by this view, I would like to draw your attention to two points which, I believe, have not been sufficiently emphasized. Dodd overlooked the fact that Jesus demands *faith*: the kingdom is there, but it is not visible to all; only in that day of days will it be fully visible, for "we walk by faith, not by sight" (2 Cor. v 7). And he also failed to discuss the significance of the Holy Spirit, which is completely eschatological in the N.T. For the receiver the Holy Spirit means being received in the coming Kingdom, the prelude to the decisive revelation in glory—the same Spirit with which Jesus was anointed. I must stop here, but what I have said should make it perfectly clear that the problem of the significance of eschatology—I am also thinking of Otto's *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn* (1934)—remains a pre-dominating question in N.T. scholarship.

It was the unforgettable merit of the great Albert Schweitzer to put this problem in the right perspective. His idea of so-called consistent eschatology—which did not find much support with scholars at the time nor aroused much opposition, and is therefore still "on their hands"—was hailed by Martin Werner from Bern in 1941 as the only correct starting point for elucidating the development of early dogma, and Werner's work was yet another stimulus to study eschatology. According to Werner Jesus was an apocalypticist who awaited the imminent end of the world and saw Himself as the judge of the world, the "son of man". When this end did not come about as easily as He expected, He thought He could accelerate it by His death. St Paul lived with the idea that the end had really taken place through the death on the cross and the resurrection, although it was not yet visible to all. It was the idea of the return which held together the whole doctrine about Christ as Lord, justification, "being in Christ", etc. When the return did not occur, however, this bond slackened; the doctrinal points came loose and had to be fitted together in a new structure. Thus, according to Werner, the eschatological gospel led logically to the uneschatological, philosophical Greek theology. Werner tried to make this

²⁹ A. M. Brouwer, *De Gelijkenissen*, Leyden 1946, p. 116-126. Cf. also H. M. Matter, *Nieuwere opvattingen omtrent het Koninkrijk Gods in Jezus' prediking naar de Synoptici*, diss. V.U., Kampen 1942; W. G. Kümmel, *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, Basel 1945.

acceptable with a superabundance of quotations and, despite numerous fundamental objections,³⁰ I have no hesitation in acclaiming this as one of the most important works to have appeared in recent years. It has brought new life into the history of early dogma, a field which was virtually closed after Von Harnack, and it raises questions in the grand style and with an original use of sources. In actual fact the question is: what became of the driving power, the eschatology, of the first communities? Did the church start, as it were, to feel at home here on earth after a few years, did it settle down cosily, or did it always retain its burning longing and prodigious nostalgia? This question can be broached from two angles: from the starting point and from the end; from a N.T. point of view and from the point of view of church history—although we can safely assume that things did not happen quite as logically as in a study in Bern. Above all the “mysticism”, the asceticism and the liturgy, of the Eastern church, must be taken into consideration, for it is not so much that an exclusively Neoplatonic philosophy and mystery piety broke through, as that an early Christian eschatology found a typical form. Precisely because these questions are so important—even from an ecumenical point of view—the study of primitive Christian literature should not be so neglected as it has been in Holland until today.

Partly as a critique of Werner, but also as an independent investigation into the primitive Christian concept of time, Cullmann provided a particularly interesting study of eschatology in his *Christus und die Zeit*, which appeared last year. In my opinion it is the best contribution to the theme to date. Primitive Christianity was eschatological through and through: the decisive act of God had happened in Christ and perfection was still to come (1 Cor. i 6-7). Eschatology was no adjunct or frame which could equally well be removed: it was the life sphere. To extract texts from this context has the same consequences as transplanting palm trees to the North Pole. This connection with the whole, which has partially been lost in the course of history, makes a constantly renewed interpretation of the early material contained in the N.T. necessary.

³⁰ M. Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, Leipzig-Bern 1941. For reviews see the list in E. Gaugler, *Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*, Basel 1943, p. 66 n.; O. Cullmann, *Christus und die Zeit*, Zollikon 1946. Here in Holland H. A. van Bakel and G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga wrote about this book in *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift* 1942-1943.

3. I mentioned as a third factor which stimulates scholarship the questions of "practical life". This is particularly true of the N.T. For the book is not just a collection of pieces of ancient literature but the authoritative book of the Church. In the Church the N.T. speaks with sole and decisive authority. Believers of every persuasion and denomination in the wide area of Christendom try to justify their views from the Scriptures and are thus duty-bound to know what is in them. The relationship between Church and Scriptures is not one-sided, but consists in a mutual interaction: the study of the Bible, especially of the N.T., leads to ecclesiastical decisions, and ecclesiastical questions of the moment appeal to the Scriptures for an answer. Whoever has studied the ecclesiastical history of the second half of the nineteenth century in our country sees at once the reciprocal link between modernism in the Church and "Bible criticism". The N.T. scholar cannot practise his profession without involving the Church time and again. I am not going to comment now on the apologetic determination to defend certain positions at all costs, which seldom leads to a deeper understanding of the Scriptures.

An appropriate example of the interaction I mean is to be found in the study of the constitution of the primitive Christian church. In his superb survey Linton pointed out that the views which were valid in about 1880 were strongly influenced by the prevailing tendencies in a contemporary ecclesiastical sphere. And if Braun can speak today of a new "consensus"³¹ amongst K. L. Schmidt, H. D. Wendland, Gloege and others, this interest in the ecclesiastical problem is not only determined by a painstaking interpretation of the word *ekklesia* or by eschatological considerations, but by the intensification of the interest in the Church aroused by the Ecumenical Movement. The difference between the Roman Catholic and Protestant concepts of church government will constantly bring scholars from both camps to devote themselves to this matter.

The liturgical movement, both in the Roman Catholic church—I have Benedictines like Odo Casel in mind—and in the Protestant

³¹ O. Linton, *Das Problem der Urkirche in der neueren Forschung*, Uppsala 1932; F. M. Braun, *Aspects nouveaux du problème de l'église*, Fribourg en Suisse 1942. Cf. also St. Hanson, *The Unity of the Church in the New Testament*, Uppsala 1946 (this title and the problem are also illustrative in connection with my further argument).

churches has kept a scholarly interest in the sacraments alive, even when the interest among church historians had started to fade. The stimulus of practice was clearly expressed when Dr de Beus defended his thesis here in 1945 and began: "The discussion held by some theologians in our country with Professor K. Barth in 1939 about whether, and if so, how far the Holy Scriptures provide the necessary Biblical foundation for the existence of infant baptism, was regarded by many as the beginning of a new awareness of the question of baptism in the Christian church in general, and of primitive Christian baptism in particular, and induced me to draft the present work".³²

Now, it is obvious that this interest can have a particularly dangerous side to it. People are looking for a definite phenomenon, must reach results, and easily neglect connected elements which have influenced the structure. A single thread is taken out of the entire tissue, and, particularly where spiritual phenomena are concerned, there is a real risk of finding the very thing one wants to find. To see the rock usually means to skirt it. In either case ecclesiastical practice influences research. Questions of N.T. introduction and genuineness, which dominated the field fifty years ago when weight was attached solely to "authenticity" and all authority vanished in the case of "inauthenticity", have faded into the background and have given way to questions about the church and the sacraments. The exaggerated philological interest has yielded to a theological one, although I fear that a certain impatience has developed in this domain, too, which is incited by the feeling: "Die Worte sind genug gewechselt, Lasst uns nun endlich Taten sehen!"

I would like to pause a little longer at a particular question—that of "unity and variety" in the N.T. For we can here detect a surprising curve which has certainly not been unaffected by the state of affairs today. As a starting point let us take the incontrovertible fact that the N.T. comprises 27 books, the work of a variety of authors, consisting of a number of different literary genres. Such diversity is especially clear where language is concerned: the Synoptic Gospels speak of the "kingdom of God"; St John of "eternal life"; St Paul of "being in Christ". Other examples are unnecessary. This introduces no difficulty into the

³² Ch. de Beus, *De oud-christelijke Doop en zijn voorgeschiedenis*, vol. I, diss. Utrecht, Haarlem 1945, p.1.

dogmatic treatment of the Bible since the "Word of God" speaks throughout, and the texts have been fairly distributed over the several *loci* of dogmatics. When, at the end of the eighteenth century and in the nineteenth century, an interest in history emerged, however, scholars developed an eye for the great variety, and N.T. theologians started to analyse the "doctrinal concepts" of the different authors. A typical example of this stage of research is to be seen in the famous textbook by B. Weiss: "N.T. theology does not offer a closed system since it has to deal with numerous different types of doctrine" (§ 4d). These types stood beside each other loosely, with no historical link. It was the grand master of historical-critical research, H. J. Holtzmann, who tried to establish this link in about 1900. He saw his objective as follows: "I am concerned with the religious-ethical range of ideas that we may learn (from the N.T.) as much in the light of the original unity which the N.T. presents to the reader, as in that of the multiplicity, variety, and even contradictions determined by individuality and the currents of the time".³³ The latter, moreover, was far more evident than the former. The division of the material took place along the following lines: the doctrine of Jesus according to the Synoptic Gospels; primitive Christianity; St Paul and post-Pauline literature (Eph., Pastoral epistles and 1 Pet.); Hebrews and Johannine literature. Scholars, relying on the discoveries of N.T. Introduction, thought that this was the right order. Of course, the contents of these pigeon holes differed greatly, according to the position of the various scholars who attempted such a description. But the analytical method triumphed and everybody followed this scheme. The diversity, and all the problems raised by it, monopolized everyone's attention.

In 1941, however, there appeared Stauffer's *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* and here, to the amazement of all, the usual approach had been thrown overboard. This book, enthralling and intense, did indeed provide a brief sketch of the main figures in the N.T.: Jesus, St Paul and St John. But the principal theme was different. The "Werdegang der urchristlichen Theologie" took up 33 pages, while the true subject, presented as being "christozentrische Geschichtstheologie", took up 180 pages. Here we have no genetic divisions, only a theological one: creation and fall; law and promise;

³³ H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*², edd. A. Jülicher-W. Bauer, Tübingen 1911, vol. I, p. 20.

the Christ event; church and world; present and future. In the various chapters of his book Stauffer does indeed give the different types an opportunity to speak, but this is not the decisive part. What is decisive is the apocalyptic framework in which he gives everything its place, a framework with these four sides—the principle of primeval history; the cosmic vision; the struggle between *civitas Dei* and *civitas diaboli*; the solution of the struggle. In this framework of “altbiblische Tradition”, by which Stauffer understands the theology of the O.T. according to late-Jewish views, the N.T. speaks a language of its own.³⁴ The theological imprint can even be seen in the constituent elements of Stauffer’s book.

We can already perceive, from these formal indications, that a radical revolution had taken place. The return to the earlier local method was only apparent. Stauffer naturally appealed to the previous historical-critical development, but he was not concerned with a historical problem. He was asking about the way of God, as the N.T. in its unity teaches us that God pursued it. This is what was so remarkable and riveting—at last here the question was asked: what is peculiar to the N.T.? While earlier scholars had tried to reduce everything to what is known to us from human religious history, or had to stop short before the “Selbstbewusstsein Jesu”, we are at last here confronted with the question of revelation. In Büchsel’s *Neutestamentliche Theologie* (1935) this theme also raised its head when he enquired about “das Wort Gottes”, but, by and large, the arrangement of the material was still the traditional historical one.

Curiously enough a similar problem seems to have come to the fore in the Anglo-Saxon world, which is the more significant as it came quite independently of what took place in Germany. I do not have the book I mentioned by Dodd in mind (although that too was symptomatic) so much as two works which, dispatching their scholarship from both sides of the Atlantic, illuminated the two sides of the problem. During the War the American N.T. scholar E. F. Scott published his gripping *Varieties of New Testament Religion*, while the Englishman Hunter produced a more modest booklet entitled *The Unity of the New Testament*.³⁵ The titles speak

³⁴ E. Stauffer, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Stuttgart 1941. This work was reprinted by the Oikoumene-Verlag in Geneva in 1945.

³⁵ E. F. Scott, *The Varieties of New Testament Religion*, New York 1943; A. M. Hunter, *The Unity of the New Testament*, London, ¹1943, ²1944.

for themselves. It appeared from their first chapters that both scholars were aware of the problem; but the man from the New World trod the old paths, while the writer from "good old England" sought a new line of approach together with his Continental counterparts. Scott denies, in so many words, that there was anything like a united formulation of faith. "All that it (sc. the church) demanded was a personal loyalty. The believer was left to form his own conception of what Christ had been, so long as he recognized his supreme claim to obedience" (p. 26). Christ revealed God (p. 13), but the "how" and the "why" could be decided by each man in his own way. The development of this process and the circumstances which determined it, form the content of Scott's book. That this, in Scott's opinion, is also of significance today, appears from these words in his introduction: "If the church is ever to be truly united, it must leave men free to differ" (p. vi). He regards this "variety of appeal" as the particular and majestic quality of Jesus' message: it can be interpreted in entirely different ways, and His richness consequently becomes ever greater (p. 297 ff.) Now, although it is right to refer to the "multicoloured wisdom" of Christ; although there is undoubtedly a development in the N.T., I wondered, when I read this book, what was typical of Christianity, what the link was uniting the various writings. For it cannot be denied that the same communities who read and preserved the Pauline epistles also handed the gospels down to us, and consequently did not find the variety so insuperable. Nor should we, as happens far too often, play one type off against the other. The concept of "loyalty" remains purely formal and does not mean very much. This, then, is my fundamental criticism of the book. Of the manner in which Scott characterizes St Paul's work I shall say no more, although, when I read these passages, I filled the margin with question marks.

Scott's counterpart Hunter does not overlook the divergences in the Synoptic Gospels, St John and St Paul, but he points to the fact that there is a unity behind this difference in terminology. To reveal this is the task of the N.T. scholar. He compares the N.T. with a jigsaw puzzle of a great many pieces. "Hitherto we have pored over the pieces in isolation and largely failed to see the picture. But now, piece after piece is slowly falling into its proper place and helping to make the whole pattern luminous" (p. 13). Although he knows that it is not possible to characterize the entire

content of the N.T. in a single word, he dares to use the word "Heilsgeschichte" as a summing-up. He speaks successively of the Redeemer (Lord), the redeemed (the Church), and the redemption, and the principal documents present their testimony in each chapter.

We see that Hunter actually shares Stauffer's approach, although he does not use the heavy words of German origin—*Urgeschichte*, *Endgeschichte*, *Allgeschichte*, etc. He does not reject the good part of the earlier analysis, but tries to reach a synthesis.

Am I wrong if I see the influence of a desire of the times in these trends? Everywhere we see a desire for unity—even if many of us have experienced a particularly diabolical fruit of that desire. People want to escape from disunity and multiplicity. In the domain of scholarship a contrast with the older generation is appearing in the shape of a return from analysis to synthesis. The older generation wished to trace the origin of a phenomenon and was then satisfied; the present generation is searching for the hallmark which these earlier elements received. The older generation looked for "schöpferische Persönlichkeiten", while contemporaries tend to see more of the crowd, not just a few high peaks, but the whole.

The N.T. scholar is not faced with the question: what did a certain Paul and a certain John think?, but with the question: how did these apostles proclaim Jesus Christ as Lord? What is the "kerygma"? The revolution, based on the question of revelation in the N.T., which the whole of theology has experienced since 1920, is undoubtedly expressed, albeit in different words, both in Stauffer and in Hunter. I believe that Hunter worked this out better than Stauffer, who gave the impression that he was discussing history of philosophy rather than God's dealings with man, "the covenant". This can be an escape from critical thinking, but it is not necessarily so. Indeed, scholars are really looking for the critical part, and the individual property of Christianity in the midst of elements of foreign origin, for its character and its claims.

Although I believe that the "spirit of the times" again opened the eyes to these questions, I do not want to make it into a scape-goat, as people so often do. Indeed, I believe the question to be fully justified. We must reach a synthesis: diversity in unity and unity in diversity. Christianity did not become a Jewish sect although it was born in Judaism. Christianity did not sink in the syncretistic maelstrom, although it was preached in the Hellenistic

world. That Christianity should have shared words and concepts with the surrounding world is obvious, and a view of this interplay can help us to understand Christian notions better. But in the last instance we must know what is peculiar to Christianity.

Fifty years ago the great radical N.T. scholar from Breslau, Wrede, suggested to Holtzmann and his companions that N.T. theology should not remain in midstream, but should turn into "religious history of primitive Christianity" and reject all connections with dogmatics. From the mouth of Wrede's kindred spirit, Bousset, Van der Leeuw heard the words: "diese Vorlesung betrifft die Theologie des neuen Testaments, das heisst also: die Religionsgeschichte der Kaiserzeit".³⁶ Many people nowadays get cold shudders at such language and entrench themselves behind a thick volume of dogmatics. The last generation would have shaken their heads gravely at Stauffer's or Hunter's works. But is there really an incompatibility? I do not wish to appear as an advocate for those tactics known as "sitting on the fence", though it may be sensible at certain times. But is it wrong to see both sides? The famous O.T. scholar from Berlin, Sellin, presented his *Alttestamentliche Theologie* in two parts, a historical part and a systematic part. They can live alongside one another and complement one another. Vriezen rightly remarked that the religious history of Israel is about Israel, the theology of the O.T. about God's revelation.³⁷ Should the N.T. not learn from the O.T. on this score, as it has so frequently done in the past? A double task awaits us: on the one hand we must study the history of primitive Christianity in the world of that time—for it is only by studying that background that the characteristics will emerge—and carry our study on into the history of the early church; and on the other we must perform a systematic survey, intimately connected with our study of history, of how God addresses man.

A variety of problems have been seen to be under discussion on this old, but ever new domain of the N.T. By pursuing new paths and taking into account the knowledge that has now been obtained of the N.T. world, scholars are trying to extract from the ancient texts the answer to the decisive question: what is the meaning of

³⁶ W. Wrede, *Über Aufgabe und Methode der sogenannten "neutestamentlichen" Theologie*, Göttingen 1897; G. van der Leeuw, in: *Inleiding tot de theologische studie*, Groningen 1946, p. 81.

³⁷ Th. C. Vriezen in: *Inleiding tot de theol. studie*, p. 42.

that "gospel of Christ which is the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith" (Rom. i 16)?

All these facts, explanations and hypotheses can be somewhat confusing and we are entitled to ask for something to hold on to. Jowett's words are comforting: "the book itself remains as at the first unchanged amid the changing interpretations of it".³⁸ The New Testament itself puts it differently, but more appropriately: "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and for ever" (Heb. xiii 8).

³⁸ B. Jowett, *The Interpretation of Scripture and Other Essays*, p. 6, quoted by F. Torm, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*, Göttingen 1930, p. 31.

SOLITUDE AND COMMUNITY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT *

Of the various forms in which solitude is encountered and experienced in this life there are two in the New Testament which are immediately evident. In the first place there is the voluntary solitude of prayer. There are several passages in the Gospels where we read that Jesus withdrew into solitude in order to pray (see Mt. xiv 23, Lk. vi 12, ix 18—perhaps we could add Jesus' departure for the wilderness after the Baptism, Mt. iv 1 ff. and parallel passages). Jesus tells his disciples, moreover, not to pray openly, but in the solitude of their room (Mt. vi 6). In this solitude community with God is sought. It is not an ultimate ideal, as it is for Eastern monks, but a fresh preparation for the tasks of the world.

In the second place there is *compulsory* solitude, imposed by the action of people whose desires are not consonant to what is seen as the way of God. The activity of Jesus brings Him into conflict with His surroundings: the choice of Jesus as Christ has the same effect for His disciples. Jn. vi 15 informs us that Jesus withdrew into solitude so that the people should not make Him king in a wrong way; when the divine design of the passion comes about Jesus prophesies and testifies that He will be abandoned by His disciples (Mk. xiv 27, 50 and parallels).

In the Gospel of St. John solitude is remedied by lasting community with the Father (xvi 32, cf. viii 16, 29); but in Mark and Matthew it may imply even the depths of the abandonment by the Father (Mk. xv 34 and parallels). The disciples also experience how their decision to follow this Lord breaks even the most natural bonds (Lk. ix 57 ff., xiv 25 ff.), although here community with God is retained. This is well expressed in St. Paul's lament in 2 Tim. iv 11 ff., where, however, we can also perceive a tone of gratitude ("But the Lord stood by me" (vs. 17)). Except in the case of the fourth word from the cross, man's withdrawal into solitude is always connected with community with God: indeed, it can even be a condition for this community.

In this essay I would like to elucidate yet another aspect of

* First appeared as "Kruising van eenzaamheid en gemeenschap in het Nieuwe Testament" in *Vox Theologica* 28, 1957-58, p. 81-86.

community and solitude in the New Testament. It appears in the Acts of the Apostles. The formulation is a little peculiar, so that the problem does not strike us immediately. But if we look closely it is indeed present, and at such a decisive point that a separate discussion is worthwhile.

In the first seven chapters of Acts the stage of the action is Jerusalem. Even when the view of the *οἰκουμένη* is at its clearest (ii 9-11) it concerns men who have come *to* Jerusalem. Only once (v 16) is a certain influence outside Jerusalem mentioned, but in this case, too, people are coming to the Holy City. This suddenly changes at the beginning of Chapter viii. The cause of the alteration is the persecution after the death of Stephen.

The event is reported as follows: "And on that day a great persecution arose against the church in Jerusalem; and they were all scattered throughout the region of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles". This brief, all too sober report presents the commentators with various problems, such as: who are "all"? Does this refer to the group to which Stephen belonged or the whole community? Why were the apostles out of range, when they, as central figures, should have been the first to be hunted down?

There is no doubt that, according to St. Luke,¹ not a single Christian remained in Jerusalem apart from the apostles, who had to see to the continuity of the faith. But from vs. 3 it appears that a number of prisoners were also taken: thus the community was indeed scattered, but they were not *all* dispersed. In vs. 4 the theme is resumed: "Now those who were scattered went about preaching the word".

How the situation really developed in those critical days is no longer clear. For St. Luke it undoubtedly serves as an introduction to the successive story of Philip (so E. Haenchen in his recent commentary), but also to that of St. Paul in ix 1 ff. Yet, as is so often the case with the introductory remarks in Acts, very little attention has been paid to this passage in commentaries. Consequently the problem which lies concealed in this curious formulation has been overlooked. The words, however, are those of St. Luke, and are therefore significant of that writer's view.

We are struck by the fact that St. Luke should describe the result of the persecution with the words "all were *scattered*" (Greek:

¹ For the sake of convenience I have accepted the traditional attribution of Acts to St Luke.

διεσπάρησαν). In vs. 4 this same verb is used. We do not read "those who had been able to escape" or "the persecuted", but "those who were scattered" (lit. the scattered, οἱ διασπαρέντες). That St. Luke used this term intentionally appears later in his book—we must not overlook these cross-references in Acts—when, in xi 19, the group—forgotten after the intervening experiences of Philip and others—turns up again: "Now those who were scattered because of the persecution that arose over Stephen travelled as far as Phoenicia" etc. (Greek: οἱ διασπαρέντες). The use of the definite article makes us think of a closed group of people living scattered, but if this is the impression we get, it is wrong: the verb has a completely different meaning in Greek, as we shall now see. That St. Luke should have used this same verb as much as three times—and that he wished to emphasize the events in this way—is all the more remarkable when we realize that the verb appears nowhere else in the New Testament.

The verb in use, διασπείρω, is a compound of σπείρω = "to sow", but that is not all there is to be said about its meaning. If we look closer at its general use, it appears that the word has a strongly *negative* implication.²

This is clear in Philo, *De conf. ling.* xxxviii 196-197, where with reference to Gen. xi 8 "the Lord dispersed them thence", he remarks: "that is He caused them to be scattered, to be fugitives, to vanish from sight, for sowing (σπείρειν) is the cause of good things, but dispersing (διασπείρειν) is the cause of bad things, for the first happens for the sake of progress, growth and birth, the second for the sake of ruin and destruction. God the Planter wanted to sow the highest virtue throughout the All, but disperse and banish accursed impiety from the state of the world" (the text has been well reconstructed by Cohn-Wendland). From these antitheses and synonyms we see what the word "scatter" implies.

The meaning of διασπείρω may be illustrated by a few more examples: 1 Sam. xi 11: "and those who survived were scattered, so that no two of them were left together"; 1 Kings xxii 17; 2 Kings xxv 5 about armies which had been defeated; Jer. xiii 24: "I will scatter you like chaff driven by the wind from the desert"; Josephus, *Antiquitates* X 65: Josiah destroys the idols and scatters their ashes;

² I hope to provide further evidence and references soon in "Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora".

Ant. X 136 the friends who fled with Zedekiah deserted him when they saw the enemy approach and "scattered in different directions, each one determined to save himself"; *Ant.* X 207 about the image of Nebuchadnezzar destroyed by the great stone: not one piece remained whole "so that the gold and silver and bronze and iron turned to dust, finer than flour, while the fragments of the image were scattered everywhere . . . by a great wind".

Yet another text, from Herodotus III 69, should be quoted at this point: in the harem of Pseudo-Smerdis there was no possibility of contact between the women since he had "scattered them, the one here, the other there, each in her appointed place". And in Plutarch, *Suav. Viv. Epic.* 27, we read: ". . . and Epicurus, by making the dissolution (of the soul) a scattering into emptiness and atoms . . .". "To scatter" is therefore more than "to put to flight"; it is "to split into loose, unconnected pieces". What has been scattered is worthless and ineffectual.

When St. Luke used this verb in viii 1, 4; xi 19, his readers understood that the community in Jerusalem was split into loose pieces which were insignificant on their own. Solitude is indeed expressed here in a peculiar way, but we must also see another dimension to it. In the Greek translation of the Old Testament the verb is frequently used in a special context, i.e. as an expression for the *divine judgment*. If Israel does not obey God's commandments and lapses into idolatry God Himself will scatter His people among the nations. Cf. Lev. xxvi 33: "And I will scatter you among the nations, and I will unsheathe the sword after you and your land shall be a desolation, and your cities shall be a waste" (cf. also Deut. iv 27; xxviii 64; xxx 4; repeatedly, too, in the prophets, especially Jeremiah, e.g. xiii 24; xv 7; and Ezekiel, e.g. xi 17; xii 15; xxii 15). This is a heavier sentence than captivity or exile. As a complement the promise is given in the Old Testament that, when a man is converted after this ordeal and devotes himself again fully to Yahweh, the scattered will be gathered and shall again be led back to the Holy Land. That is why the pious Jew in the "Eighteen Benedictions" prayed, and still prays: (10) "Blow on a great trumpet for our deliverance, raise a banner to gather our banished; praise unto You, Yahweh, who gathers the scattered people of Israel" (see also 2 Macc. i 27 "Gather those together that are scattered from us, deliver them that serve among the heathen").

The idea of "gathering the scattered" is a constant element in the expectation of the Messianic time.³

Throughout his work St. Luke appears to be well acquainted with the Greek translation of the O.T. This nuance of διασπείρω was consequently known to him. The scattering seems to be connected with God's curse, and that at a time when the Christian community believed that the Messianic age had arrived with Jesus, with His life, death and resurrection.

According to St. Luke's report the Christians were driven out of Jerusalem. This fact must also be emphasized in the light of O.T. promises. It is not said of an arbitrary community in an arbitrary town, but of the Messianic community in Jerusalem. For Jerusalem was central to the Jewish expectation of the future; it was there that salvation would appear. See, for example, Joel ii 32 (important in this respect because of the echo in Acts ii 21 and 39): "And it shall come to pass that all who call upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be those who escape, as the Lord has said, and among the survivors shall be those whom the Lord calls"; and Obadiah vs. 17: "But in Mount Zion there shall be those that escape" (escape = Greek σωτηρία = salvation, redemption). The pagans will only come to Jerusalem to see the glory of the Lord (Is. ii 2-3, lx-lxii).⁴

If we read the relevant passages against the background of the Old Testament and of the current linguistic usage I have sketched, the following remarkable facts will spring into view:

a) these people are driven out of the community (Gr. ἐκκλησία = people of God) into "dispersion"; from the place where salvation will be revealed, to the land of the pagans, into solitude, without any unity.

b) they are "scattered" instead of "gathered", i.e. in the eyes of the Jews they bear the curse.

c) but, contrary to what we might expect, they preach the message of salvation, not only to the Jews but also to the pagans (viii 4; xi 19). It is not the scattered that must be converted to the Lord, but they must bring others to conversion (xi 21). The "Hand of the Lord", i.e. His support (cf. Lk. i 66), is with these "scattered".⁵

³ Cf. P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*², Tübingen 1934, p. 344 ff.

⁴ Cf. J. Jeremias, *Jesu Verheissung für die Völker*, Stuttgart 1956, p. 49 ff.

⁵ W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des N.T.*⁴, Berlin 1952, col. 1598.

Thus did this far-reaching solitude help to carry the gospel into the world and so to build the new community of the church of Christ. In this description in Acts viii 1, 4 St. Luke presents a remarkable turning point in the history of primitive Christianity. For it is through this persecution that the community goes outside Jerusalem and this fact starts the preaching to Samaritans and pagans.

This preaching to the pagans, so significant an event for the history of the church and the world, was not conceived as a plan by missionary strategy, but simply came about "by chance". In the later apocryphal legends about the apostles we come across the idea that the apostles cast lots for the division of the world in order to determine each one's field of activity and that each one prepared himself to go there.⁶ In St. Luke's Acts, however, the apostles remain in Jerusalem; nobody leaves the "Holy City" of his own accord. The rest of the community left, but not like the disciples whom Jesus dispatched two by two: they were "scattered". And this was the consequence of a persecution, not of a human initiative.

In St. Luke's conception throughout the Acts of the Apostles, this persecution appears to have been used by God to spread the gospel. The expected sequence is entirely reversed. The Christians are forced out of Jerusalem into the world; that which seemed a curse for the banished becomes a blessing for others.⁷ The scattering does not lead to destruction, but to the formation of new communities: xi 19 ff. brings us to Antioch, whence Paul later set out on his missions. The solitude does not entail destruction, for the Christians take with them the word of God and faith in Jesus Christ, which are not bound to any place or circle but rather create a new community.

We have seen how Philo contrasted *σπείρω* and *διασπείρω* ("sow" and "scatter"). The scattering intended by St. Luke in the passages I have discussed recalls the words of Jesus (Jn. xii 24): "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and

⁶ R. A. Lipsius, *Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, Braunschweig 1883, vol. I, p. 11 ff. gives the various versions of this legend.

⁷ In the third century A.D. we find a similar idea in Judaism, see Pesachim fol. 87b: the children of Israel are scattered in order to make proselytes. Cf. also Origen, *Contra Celsum* I 55. But this idea was expressed a good hundred years after Acts; besides it was not generally accepted, and cannot therefore be used as a means of judging the Diaspora.

dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit". Here "scattering" and sowing, solitude and community, meet in a distinctive way. The paradox of the gospel comes into view. St. Luke expresses this in a manner of his own; he expresses it soberly but his words are charged with meaning: they tell of human misery and terror which turn into the joy of divine salvation.

JESUS THE CHRIST¹ *

On a warm, sunny afternoon—one which we so much missed this year in our part of the globe—I stood on the beach of our Dutch seacoast. There was a crowd so tightly packed that one could hardly discover the sand or the sea. The only thing one sees is the highly variegated species of man; the only thing one hears is the cacophony of sound produced by this crowd. If one is interested in the beauty of the sea the sight is rather disappointing; if the study of man has not lost its attraction, it is highly rewarding: to watch all these people in their various dresses or undressings; large and small; to see how they critically examine one another and the respective dresses. It is quite easy to pick out the foreigners, many Germans, some Americans and English. It is an ant-hill; it is pleasant and refreshing, somewhat too busy, an out-of-the-way part of the world, unaffected, so it seems, by the burning problems of mankind.

Behold, my friends, is this not the likeness of the world of New Testament scholarship? There is no need to take the tools of learning immediately in hand and to submit this piece of prose to the tests of "Motiv-Forschung", source-criticism or linguistic analysis. The condition of N.T. scholarship is in many respects a very favourable one. The increase of membership in our society reflects the growing number of those who devote themselves to this study, and unless all signs fail this tendency will continue. The rich literary output in books and articles is another sign of the healthy state of affairs: its mass is enormous and perplexing. Each issue of a bibliography in our field makes one happy over so much labour done and gives the uneasy feeling or bad conscience of all that we have left undone in research and reading. We are all working with and deriving our wisdom from the same little book, though we sometimes mix a portion of our own wisdom with it, of course, to enhance its value. But we are so many in such a small place that it is often hard to get at the booklet itself. So many valuable observations have been made, so many theories put forward that collecting and sifting them takes more than a lifetime. Of course, one can leave aside everything

* Appeared in *New Testament Studies* 8, 1962, p. 101-16.

¹ Presidential Address, delivered to the St Andrews meeting of S.N.T.S., on Tuesday, 5 September 1961.

except a few that are for the most part in agreement with one's own opinion, but that procedure does not speak well for our respect towards our fellow-labourers, nor for the critical attitude towards oneself. There is a cacophony of opinions on major and minor points.

I do abstain from elaborating the comparison with the bathing-costumes or other dresses. But there is another point to which our attention is attracted. There is a growing unity in our N.T. studies which cuts right through national frontiers and ecclesiastical barriers. We use the same tools, our Bauer, Billerbeck and Kittel-Friedrich; we consult the same periodicals. We enjoy the good fortune of personal friendships. There is a marked difference here from the situation of, say, a quarter of a century ago. And yet there are unmistakable features which characterize various nationalities or ecclesiastical loyalties. "Die Formgeschichtler", says Conzelmann, "sind von drüben (outside Germany) gesehen eine kleine, etwas komische Sekte mit Mangel an gesundem common sense."² I dare not say whether this is true or not. I have met many people 'von drüben' who had a high regard for "Formgeschichtler", and I have met German students who found every N.T. scholar not initiated in the mysteries of existential interpretation a poor beggar, a judgement with which the uninitiated were not very pleased. There is a difference between the universities, the spiritual climate, the religious situation of England and Germany for example, and this has its effects on our work. It would be interesting to investigate how much, where and how it influences scholarly production. We do not need a deadly uniformity, but must also be on our guard against scientific provincialism. The national and ecclesiastical differences must bring a cross-fertilization, also, by that heart-searching question: "Why is that which is self-evident for me not so for another person?"

We quietly carry on our study of the New Testament, of Christian origins, in a world which fights for its future and wrestles with the problem of the coexistence of nations and individuals, where the tensions are daily intensified. Let us humbly say that many of the great questions hotly debated among us are, in the compass of this world, nothing more than a storm in a teacup or even less. But, however unimportant this work may seem, we go on with it. This study of the past is not a very learned tranquillizer, but by one way

² H. Conzelmann, *Zur Methode der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, *Z. Theol. Kirche*, LVI (1959), Beiheft 1 (Tübingen, 1959), p. 7.

or another we are convinced that the message of the N.T. is still valid today and that it will remain of prime, decisive importance.

The message of the New Testament—what is that? With that big question we are all concerned; it is there, even in the study of the little details. Is it the message *of* or *about* Jesus Christ? He is the central figure, the definitive revelation and the great mystery.

Attention has been focused lately on this problem again in a huge volume of essays, published in Eastern Germany: *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus*.³ It is called forth by the debate started in Germany in 1954 by an article of Ernst Käsemann: "Das Problem des historischen Jesus".⁴ Especially in the circle of Bultmann's disciples this paper made a great stir, but not only there. The question is: since the form-critical analysis has shown that the gospels are the product of the Christian community which confessed Jesus as the risen Christ, can we get back behind the Resurrection into the life of Jesus between his birth and death, and if so what was—historically and theologically—the relation between the message before and after the Resurrection? Is there a continuity or not? It would be impossible within the limits set to an address like this to summarize the debate provoked by this challenging paper; and fortunately there is no need to do so, because J. M. Robinson gave an excellent survey in his *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*.⁵

One can be sure that this will not be the end of the debate. History, the famous historian Pieter Geyl has said, is an endless debate. That certainly applies to Christianity not only as far as it is a religion bound up with a historical revelation, but also since every generation has to confess anew in personal commitment. It is a central question and the answer to it is decisive for a good many other problems. We may be deeply grateful to those scholars who contributed so far to clarify the problem by expressing their opinion, their way of approach and the complexity of the issue. Many questions in various fields, such as New Testament introduction, development of N.T. theology, dogmatics, theory of historical

³ H. Ristow-K. Matthiae (eds.), *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus* (Berlin, 1960).

⁴ First published in *Z. Theol. Kirche*, LI (1954), 125-53; reprinted in E. Käsemann, *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (Göttingen, 1960), I, 187-214.

⁵ London, 1959; a German edition with the title: *Kerygma und historischer Jesus* (Zürich, 1960), is enlarged and brings the story of the debate up to date.

research are involved. Since this is a theme with which we all in various degrees are concerned, it seemed to me a very suitable topic for this occasion. But it goes without saying that we cannot deal with all sides of this problem in the time at our disposal. So I took that point which brings us into the heart of the matter, which is in my opinion its pivot.

As you will have noticed, I did not formulate my theme with the words: "the historical Jesus and the kerygmatic Christ", the reason being that I doubt whether this stating of the problem brings the question clearly to light. The following considerations led me to that opinion:

1. The terms in themselves are not unequivocal. In discussing the combination: "the historical Jesus", Robinson distinguishes two meanings and Ebeling even four.⁶ The word "kerygma" has also different connotations: sometimes it means the missionary message of the apostles, but in Bultmann's usage it has a much more pregnant sense. The use of these terms would lead us into a discussion of their meaning and suitability, but away from what seems to me most fundamental.⁷

2. This juxtaposition of "historical Jesus" and "kerygmatic Christ" has a tendency to confuse things. Some fifty years ago there was a lively debate here in England under the title "Jesus or Christ",⁸ called forth by an article of Rev. Roberts pointing out the discrepancy between the man Jesus, as pictured by the "Leben-Jesu-Forschung" and the Christ, as professed by the church, the embodiment of the loftiest ideals of mankind. It is rather strange and confusing to give the choice between "Jesus" and "Christ". Since the former is a personal name and the latter a title, the two designations are taken from a different level; they are not compar-

⁶ J. M. Robinson, *Kerygma*, pp. 39 ff.; *Quest*, pp. 26 ff.: "Jesus of Nazareth as he actually was" and "what can be known of Jesus of Nazareth by means of the scientific methods of the historian". G. Ebeling, "Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus und das Problem der Christologie", *Z. Theol. Kirche*, LVI (1959), Beiheft I (Tübingen, 1959), p. 20: "Der wirkliche Jesus, der rein menschliche Jesus, der zeitgeschichtlich bedingte, rein historische Jesus und der zum historischen Bild objectivierte und somit entwirklichte Jesus".

⁷ In this connexion I should like to draw attention to the very searching examination of Bultmann's use of the term "Kerygma" in the thesis of J. M. de Jong, *Kerygma, een onderzoek naar de vooronderstellingen van de theologie van Rudolf Bultmann* (Assen, 1958).

⁸ "Jesus or Christ?", being the *Hibbert Journal Supplement for 1909* (London, 1909).

able. Moreover, it is clear that "Christ" is used here in a Christian sense, and it is highly questionable if this is the right use of the word (we shall return to this point later on). Of course, the present discussion is not a repetition of the older one.⁹ Too much has happened since: the failure of the "Leben-Jesu-Forschung"; the rise of form-criticism; instead of the so-called liberal theology the rise of dialectical theology. But there is a warning here: not to put on the same level incommensurable quantities, as though they were somehow interchangeable.

3. We must clearly distinguish between two sets of questions: the historic and dogmatic. In the former we have to ask why the early Christians, as we hear their voices in the New Testament, came to look upon the man Jesus of Nazareth as the decisive revelation of God not only for the past, but also for the present; in the latter we are confronted with the question whether, and if so how and why, this decisive revelation in Jesus affects us and our world of today, how he can be confessed, preached and obeyed in our generation. It is necessary to keep these two apart in our theological thinking; otherwise it will be confusion worse confounded. To be sure, the two sets of questions are closely connected, often intertwined, but they are different. I am afraid that the introduction of "kerygmatic" next to, may be in opposition to, "historic" turns to a premature mixture. Let me put it this way: in the N.T. the word "Christ" has also a historic side and "Jesus" a kerygmatic side, for example in the confession "the Lord Jesus".

Hence I prefer to formulate the problem in these terms: Jesus of Nazareth—Jesus the Christ. And thereby is the first-historical-question: *Why and how did this title "Christ" come to be combined with the man Jesus?*

It is superfluous to carry coals to Newcastle; superfluous to give a long discourse to an audience like this on the title "Christ". We

⁹ In this connexion we may also refer to an even older discussion of the theme. In 1894 the well-known Old Testament scholar J. J. P. Valetton, Jr, read a paper: *De "Historische Jesus" en de "Christus der Kerk"*, published in his *Gehuigenissen* (Nijmegen, 1907), pp. 1-26. He shows some influence of Martin Kaehler, but it is very striking to notice here remarkable anticipations of statements made by Bultmann. One wonders how the course of the New Testament studies would have been if these theses, for example about the non-biographical character of the gospels, had been accepted by the leading "Wissenschaftler" of that time! The answer is of course impossible, but the reflexion may teach us an interesting lesson.

all know that the Greek word is a translation of the Hebrew (Aramaic) Messiah—the Anointed One; that this title was current among the Jews in the N.T. period as a designation of the eschatological king over the restored Jewish nation and that it is a human person, but that this figure does not appear in all pictures of the future and a variety of opinion was in existence.¹⁰ Qumran has yielded additional material, though it is still a matter of dispute whether one or two Messiahs, a kingly and a priestly, were expected.¹¹ However this may be, it is beyond doubt that the title “Messiah-Christ” was not used for any figure whatever, but had a definite content and evoked definite connotations. It is a term which specifically belongs to Jewish theology; in this respect it has a certain fixed place, quite different from a word like *Kyrios*. Though the place of this figure, designated by “Messiah”, may be vague, the word itself had a clear meaning.

When we now turn to the use of this title in connexion with Jesus, we see that in the first Christian writings which we possess up till now, the Pauline Epistles, this title in its Greek form was so closely connected with the proper name Jesus that it had almost become a second name.¹² It does not function, except in the combination 2 Cor. i 21: ὁ βεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς θεός. It will also be remembered that Paul does not use the word βασιλεύς for Jesus, though he speaks about the βασιλεία of Jesus.

We deduce from this fact that within twenty years after Jesus' crucifixion this Jewish title had been so firmly connected with Jesus that it had almost lost its original meaning (see below); that it had been translated into Greek in the course of the two decades, which shows that at that stage it was still understood in its original meaning.

¹⁰ It may be sufficient to refer to the material discussed in W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*³ (Tübingen, 1926), pp. 222 ff.; P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*² (Tübingen, 1934), pp. 173 ff.; S. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh* (Oxford, 1956).

¹¹ A. S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (Assen, 1957); M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Edinburgh, 1961), pp. 145 ff.

¹² Cf. N. A. Dahl, *Die Messianität Jesu bei Paulus*, in *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan* (Haarlem, 1953), pp. 83 ff. (cf. p. 88): “Paulus vertretet ein auffallend fortgeschrittenes Stadium in der Entwicklung, die dazu führte, daß Χριστός aus einer Messiasbezeichnung zu einem zweiten Eigennamen Jesu wurde”.

The question now is: how and why could this designation with this specific Jewish content be applied to Jesus? There must have been something in this man, his life and work, which made it possible to make this connexion. If it is said about Mr Johnson that he is an excellent full-back or a fine spin-bowler, I hear from these descriptions what kind of sport Mr Johnson practises. These words say something very definite about him, place him in a certain, well-defined setting. Of course there are impostors who assume a title without being entitled to it; but even then such a man must show the outward appearance of the title. The title "Christ-Messiah" did not mean everything and nothing, it had a very definite meaning for the Jews in the first century. In early Christianity it was felt that proof had to be given that Jesus was really entitled to bear the name of Messiah; the fourth Gospel is professedly written to make readers believe "that Jesus is the Anointed One, the Son of God" (John xx 31) ¹³ and it speaks of him as "the king of the Jews".

Now the trouble here is that the image of Jesus in the N.T., both in his earthly life and in his exalted state, has not very much in common with the picture of the Messianic king in Jewish sources. So the differences are usually underscored. In the course of nineteen centuries with Christian preaching, thinking, praising Jesus Christ, the Saviour in glory has so completely moulded the meaning of the word "Christ" that we have forgotten that once in the very beginning it was different: not Jesus—once in humility, now in glory—gave meaning to the title "Christ", but the common Jewish category "Christ-Messiah" gave meaning to the person Jesus. Centuries of Christological thinking have laid a crust over the meaning "Christ-Messiah" had for the Jews in Jesus' days. This process was already on its way in the N.T. As soon as Christianity stepped outside the Jewish sphere, this typical designation lost its matrix because it had no place in pagan "theology" and was meaningless to the Greeks and Romans; it dried out, was fossilized. But fossils are important witnesses to a previous stage of life.

In the study of N.T. Christology we must distinguish better than has been done so far between images and titles; between names taken from "outside" and those which were thought appropriate in connexion with the special "case" of Jesus. The so-called "Testimonies" in use among the early Christians are largely invention *post*

¹³ See my paper *The Purpose of St. John's Gospel*, in: *Studia Evangelica* (Berlin, 1959), pp. 382 ff., in *Sparsa Collecta* I 35-63.

eventum, but have in their turn influenced later thinking. Moreover, one has to be more discriminating in the use of terms than is often the case; especially with regard to the Christology of the Synoptic Gospels: there is often a tendency to substitute one term for the other: Christ > Son of Man > Suffering Servant.

In trying to find an answer to our question we meet with several possibilities. Cullmann and Vincent Taylor leave the answer open.¹⁴ G. Sevenster, in his important *Christologie van het Nieuwe Testament*, speaks about the meaning of the name in the Synoptic Gospels, points out the variety in Jewish conceptions, the absence of any political conception of Jesus' Messiahship, and lays all stress on the "Son of Man"-title which gives the real expression of Jesus' idea. For what reason Jesus was called by that name Χριστός remains unclear; but at any rate it goes back to Jesus' understanding of his own life.¹⁵

According to William Manson we have to do with a complete "metabasis eis allo genos"; he says: "it must . . . be insisted that all Messianic ideas, from whatever source derived, underwent a total change in being appropriated to Jesus the Crucified".¹⁶ That may be true for the Christian tradition, but does not explain why on earth such titles were used for Jesus; on the contrary it makes the question of the common factor the more urgent. Héring denies all connexion between Jesus on earth and the Messianic titles; Jesus' enthronization came after his Resurrection, and the "messianization" of the gospel-tradition was made afterwards for apologetic reasons.¹⁷ While postponing a discussion of the first part of this thesis, we must remark that what we really know about Christian apologetics is that it tried to prove from the Old Testament that the life-story of Jesus corresponded with what was foretold, but not that it antedated his kingship.

The once familiar reference to Jesus' "Messianic consciousness" does not enjoy much popularity today, because the Gospels do not

¹⁴ O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen, 1958), pp. 111 ff.; V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (London, 1953), pp. 10 ff.

¹⁵ G. Sevenster, *De Christologie van het Nieuwe Testament*² (Amsterdam, 1948), pp. 73 f.

¹⁶ W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah* (London, 1945), p. 8; cf. also p. 12: "The Christian tradition of Jesus as Messiah and Son of Man has in fact nothing except these titles in common with the Jewish national and apocalyptic visions of the coming Deliverer".

¹⁷ J. Héring, *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue* (Paris, 1937), pp. 50 ff., esp. p. 129.

give any possibility to discover the inner life of Jesus. But one cannot rule this out by a simple decree like Bultmann, by saying that "die etwaige Feststellung der Tatsache, daß Jesus sich als den 'Messias' bzw. 'Menschensohn' gewußt habe, würde ein historisches Faktum feststellen, keinen Glaubenssatz erweisen" because this faith would miss the character of "persönliche Entscheidung".¹⁸ This is a clear example of a dogmatic judgement influencing historical research. But Bultmann has more to say: Jesus' appearance had nothing of Messianic features; what we find as such is retroprojection made by the Christian community after the Resurrection; Jesus was a rabbi and prophet who was venerated by the community as Messiah after the Resurrection.¹⁹ In this construction, which underlies Bultmann's whole position, it remains unclear what the Resurrection really was; how the disciples came to believe that Jesus was risen. It remains equally unclear why this rabbi-prophet was crucified. This was, as Bultmann himself rightly points out, a political capital punishment which he declares due to misunderstanding.²⁰ But why was Jesus misunderstood and by whom? By the Romans or by the Jews? In one of the earliest writings of the N.T. it is expressly said that the Jews killed the Lord (1 Thess. ii 15); it would be historical prejudice to rule out this statement, dating from a time no more than twenty years after the event. Paul must have known what he was talking about; he had access to better sources of information than we. So the Jews must have suggested that Jesus was an insurgent. How can that be, if Jesus was only a rabbi-prophet?

In Bultmann's view the unmessianic figure of Jesus was changed into the Messiah by the Resurrection. That this event was the great turning-point is clear from the N.T., but is there any evidence that it produced this complete change, so that suddenly the prophet was metamorphosed into a figure to which the category of the *Jewish* Messiah could be applied with good reason? As far as we know the Jewish ideas about the Messiah, he is always so *before* and not after his death. Bultmann always adduces these texts: Acts ii 36; Rom. i 3 f. and Phil. ii 9. But do they give the required evidence? A short discussion is necessary.

¹⁸ R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen, 1953), p. 26.

¹⁹ Bultmann, *loc. cit.* pp. 27 ff.

²⁰ R. Bultmann, *Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus*² (Heidelberg, 1961), p. 12.

In Acts ii 36 "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified", the Resurrection is not specifically mentioned. There is no sign that Luke adopted here a previously existing formula, but this verse is the conclusion of the whole preceding argument (οὖν); it is that powerful conclusion that is aiming at repentance. During Jesus' earthly career he was a man ἀποδεδειγμένος ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις, οἷς ἐποίησεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ θεός—his death was part of God's plan and his resurrection followed "because it was not possible for him to be held by death" (v. 24). This is proved by the text of Ps. xvi 8-11 which does not apply to David. The Psalmist spoke "of the resurrection of the Christ"—his "flesh" (v. 31) is used as a substitute for "thy Holy One" in the quotation (v. 27). The whole mission of Jesus was God's action from beginning to end: the Christ was not abandoned to Hades (v. 31). This man of Nazareth, whom the Jews had crucified, was the Messiah, as witnessed by the signs, by the fulfilment of David's prophecy. The Resurrection is not a metamorphosis, but a confirmation of what Jesus really was, though he had seemed to the Jews quite different, so that they had killed him—which was also included in God's plan. In Rom. i 3-4 the case is different; there the Resurrection is mentioned: "concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh and designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection". As may be seen from the commentaries these words are generally considered as an older Messianic formula, one remarkable thing being here πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης instead of πνεῦμα ἅγιον. From the sentence-structure it is clear that this "Spirit of holiness", a Semitic circumscription, is parallel to the "according to the flesh". The whole sentence is an explication not of "Jesus Christ" whose name comes at the end of the sentence, but of the words: "concerning his Son", who is on the one hand a descendant of David and on the other: "Son of God". But does this say that he has only become "Son of God" by the Resurrection? No, because in that case the grammatical connexion περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ would hardly make any sense. Besides that, the words ἐν δυνάμει were superfluous. They break the parallelism between the former and the latter part. The Resurrection did not *make* Jesus "the Son of God": he was it already as a descendant of David, but this fact was powerfully marked out by the Resurrection. This text

is important, because it shows that Paul knows a tradition about Jesus as "Son of David". But is this fact in itself sufficient to qualify him as the Messiah? No. Paul has known brethren of Jesus (1 Cor. ix 5) and in that family the tradition of royal descent was according to Hegesippus still alive at the end of the first century;²¹ but the members of this family were not all "Messiahs". Belonging to the Davidic family was important, but not the only thing that entitled Jesus to Messiahship: this he was *κατὰ σάρκα*, "Son of God" is he *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*. Another interesting observation can be made: this clearly Messianic formula fits in the context by the word: "Son of God". Does this not suggest that the relation between the conceptions of Messiah and "Son of God" were closer than is often assumed? — The hymn in Philippians ii does not speak about Jesus' Messiahship; it confesses that he received the name of *κύριος*. None of these texts can help us to solve the question: why Jesus was called the "Messiah".

Quite a different way is followed by Craig²² and Dahl.²³ Though their argumentation is somewhat different, both come to the conclusion that the early Christians came to combine this title "Christ" with Jesus, because he was crucified as "Messiah". Let me put it in the words of Dahl:

"die Übertragung des Messias-titels auf Jesus (kann)nicht in dem Studium und den Diskussionen der ersten Christen mit dem Juden seinen Grund haben. Die Messianität des gekreuzigten Jesus ist vielmehr die Voraussetzung, die dem ganzen Schriftbeweis de Christo zugrunde liegt. Da die zentrale Stellung des Messias-namens nicht aus der Verkündigung Jesu erklärt werden kann, bleibt uns die eine Möglichkeit: Der Titel Messias ist deshalb mit dem Namen unlösbar verbunden worden, weil Jesus als angeblicher Messias verurteilt und gekreuzigt wurde (pp. 162 f.). Für eine historische Tatsache dürfen wir es aber halten, daß Jesus nichts getan hat, um sich der Verurteilung und Kreuzigung als "König der Juden" zu entziehen (p. 167)."

There is much in this position with which I wholeheartedly agree. It is true that the words of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels do not

²¹ Hegesippus, *ap.* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* III, 19 ff.

²² C. T. Craig, *The Problem of the Messiahship of Jesus*, in E. P. Booth (ed.), *New Testament Studies* (New York, Nashville, 1942), pp. 95 ff.

²³ N. A. Dahl, *Der gekreuzigte Messias, der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus*, pp. 149 ff.

contain an explanation of this title, a number of these being clearly Christian.²⁴ The early Christian preaching as witnessed by Paul had as its centre the crucified Messiah, and the reason for the crucifixion is otherwise so unexplainable that we cannot but consider the Passion-story true to fact in this respect.²⁵ It may also be granted that the Christian conception of the Messiah was remodelled according to the life-story of Jesus. We may repeat once more what has been said many times: the portrait of the Messiah in Jewish literature with its many variations has hardly anything in common with the portrait of Jesus in the Gospels. But then there remains an important point unexplained: *why did the first followers of Jesus accept this name* to such an extent that they were called Χριστιανοί? Modern scholarship, in comparing the Jewish and Christian conception, comes to the conclusion that they are separated by a big gulf. Yet the early Christians have accepted the title for their Master and it was so living a title that they translated it into Greek. Why? Where is the bridge, the missing link? It is not only Jesus' claim that matters, but also the acceptance of that claim on the side of the believers.

Was Jesus not an impostor? The early Christians knew that there were others who claimed the title of Messiah: "If anyone says to you, 'Look, here is the Christ', or 'Look, there he is' do not believe it. False Christs and false prophets will arise and show signs and wonders" (Mark xiii 21-2, cf. also v. 6). One had to make one's choice. How did they substantiate their faith in Jesus as the Messiah?

They too were aware that Jesus in his earthly appearance had not the features of the King-Messiah. The authenticity of the famous confession of Peter is highly disputed. But it is remarkable that in this connexion a word of Jesus was transmitted: "Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven" (Matt. xvi 17). Whether this word is genuine or invented, in either case it is an expression of the fact that this confession was not a logical conclusion to which Peter had come himself in seeing Jesus, but that it has flashed upon him as a special revelation.

Do we ourselves sufficiently realize into how difficult a situation

²⁴ This has already been pointed out by various authors; see for example, E. Stauffer, *Messias oder Menschensohn, Novum Testamentum*, I (1956), 81 ff.

²⁵ See also the discussion on the reasons of the crucifixion and the title on the cross in J. Blinzler, *Der Prozess Jesu*³ (Regensburg, 1960).

the early Christians had manoeuvred themselves by claiming that Jesus the crucified was the Messiah? For them the Resurrection and Ascension were the assurance that Jesus was king. But they did not suppress the fact of his crucifixion. On the contrary: "I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor. ii 2) and the Gospels told the story of the cross at great length. They did not drop the epithet "Christ", but put it in the forefront. This claim was rejected by their Jewish contemporaries, at times in a very harsh manner. Paul knows that the cross is a stumbling-block for the Jews (1 Cor. i 23). Now he says in the summary of his preaching that Christ died "according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. xv 3) and the Gospel about the Son had been foretold by the prophets (Rom. i 2). In his letters he does not adduce proof-texts to show that Jesus the crucified was the Messiah, because that was beyond doubt believed by the readers of his letters (we must always bear in mind that the Pauline Epistles are only part of his work). In Acts, however, we find several instances of disputes with the Jews in which the theme is: "The Messiah must suffer" and "This Messiah is Jesus"²⁶ and this is also behind an expression such as "Jesus Christ and him crucified". In Luke xxiv 26 f., 44 ff. the *risen* Lord gives instruction how the Scriptures witness concerning him: "that the Christ should suffer and enter into his glory". This conception of the suffering Messiah was evidently unheard of and was adjusted to the events in Jesus' life. This fact is, it seems to me, a clear indication that the idea of a suffering Messiah was not current in Judaism at the time. It makes the question the more urgent, how and why the disciples stuck to that title. There-with they took a heavy mortgage upon themselves.

Jesus' person and work must have given rise to Messianic hopes of the restoration of Israel.²⁷ The disappointment expressed in Luke xxiv 21: "we had hoped that he (Jesus the prophet) was the one to redeem Israel" cannot have been invented by a later Chris-

²⁶ I discussed these texts in: *The Purpose of St John's Gospel*, pp. 395 ff.; see also Acts iii 18. I do not agree with Dahl, *loc. cit.* p. 160, that this is a "spätere Theologisierung". This was simply forced upon the Christians as the main topic of discussion with the Jews. That Paul uses ἀπέθανεν in 1 Cor. xv 3 is determined by the problem of that chapter where not the suffering of the Messiah, but his Resurrection is the main theme, for which the death is presupposition.

²⁷ On Jesus' relation to political Messiahship see, among others, H. van der Loos, *Jezus, Messias-koning* (Assen, 1942).

tian. It is in line with Acts i 6: "Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel", where the passion is seen as an interlude. The ultimate goal was that blessed state of Israel for which so many had hoped and prayed.

Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom of God must have given that tune on the sounding-board of his Jewish hearers. But if these hopes were connected with him, his followers must have seen in him the Messiah.

For what reason was Jesus put to death? The *titulus* on the cross was the charge: "King of the Jews". That is a solid historical fact. Was that an unfounded charge of a dignity thrust upon Jesus by his opponents? ²⁸ It is hard to believe so. This accusation was the only one that could be successful in the court of the Roman governor. The Jewish leaders could not come with a futile charge. But then, why was Jesus condemned by the Sanhedrin? The Messianic claim, so it is usually maintained, could be no ground for the death penalty; moreover, the High Priest speaks of "blasphemy", but under that heading Messiahship cannot be subsumed. Now the High Priest has asked: "Are you the Christ, the son of the Blessed?" (Mark xiv 61). The expression: "the Blessed" for God is certainly Jewish. Many scholars are, however, inclined to take the words "the Son of the Blessed" as a Christian addition, where Jesus was adored as "the Son of God" in a metaphysical sense. That this text was so interpreted by the evangelists may be true, but does that imply that the word itself was not used? A Qumran testimonium gives a Messianic interpretation to 2 Sam. vii 12 ff.: "I will be his father and he shall be my son", ²⁹ and Black thinks that Ps. ii 7 was used in the same way. ³⁰ The combination of "Messiah" and "Son of God" was possible in Judaism. But it is also clear that if the man of Nazareth claimed to be that, he was uttering blasphemy in Jewish ears. It is not said what reasons the High Priest had for his statement; here no witnesses are called in. It sounds as though it was a strong suspicion which was confirmed by Jesus' own testimony. Only this two-edged charge makes sense of the trial.

Why was it possible to attach this title to the rabbi of Nazareth?

²⁸ I cannot go into a detailed discussion of the many questions connected with the trial of Jesus; it may be sufficient to refer to Blinzler's book.

²⁹ Van der Woude, *loc. cit.* pp. 173 f.

³⁰ M. Black, *loc. cit.* p. 149.

In spite of Friedrich's interesting argument³¹ I am not convinced that Jesus was identified with the priestly Messiah: Jesus was not from levitical descent; he did not function as a priest and the clumsy way in which the Epistle to the Hebrews tries to make Jesus a High Priest makes this impossible. What impression did Jesus make upon his contemporaries? He was addressed as "rabbi" or "teacher". In Mark viii 28 the current opinion is summarized in the words: he is "John the Baptist, Elijah or one of the prophets". This formulation can hardly be due to the post-resurrection period. Cf. also Mark vi 14 f., where the wonder-working power of Jesus is explained by the fact that he is the revived John the Baptist. In any case he is seen to be in the line of the prophets.³² The same is expressed in Luke xxiv 19 which is remarkable because there the resurrection of Israel is expected from this prophet. Here lies a possible connexion with the Messianic title. An eschatological prophet was expected on account of Deut. xviii 15, though it is not clear that he was identified with the Messiah.³³ Josephus uses the word "prophet" in connexion with a certain Theudas and an Egyptian, who are also called "sorcerers" (γόητες), as some others who did "signs".³⁴ There is no word of kingship or Messiahship in these stories, but that may be due to purpose on the part of Josephus. So one cannot be sure that these people considered themselves as prophets taken for "Messiahs", although that is often done and suggested by the remarkable parallel in Matt. xxiv 23 f.

Be that as it may, in any case the liberation of Israel was the aim of these prophets. A reasonable comparison between such movements and that of Jesus could be made (cf. Acts v 36 f.). But in the case of Jesus nothing pointed to revolt against the Romans. Of course, if the entry into Jerusalem (Mark xii 1 ff.) has a historical background³⁵—and I do not see convincing reasons against it—

³¹ G. Friedrich, *Beobachtungen zur messianischen Hohepriestererwartung in den Synoptikern*, *Z. Theol. Kirche* LIII (1956), 265 ff.; the objection derived from the Epistle to the Hebrews is mentioned by Friedrich himself, p. 310.

³² Cf. F. Gils, *Jésus prophète* (Louvain, 1957) and the literature mentioned there.

³³ See the full discussion of the material in connexion with the Qumran material by Van der Woude, *loc. cit.* pp. 78 ff.

³⁴ Josephus, *Ant.* XX, 5, 1 par. 97; XX, 8, 6 par. 167; *Bell. Jud.* II, 13, 4 par. 258.

³⁵ See the discussion of the various opinions in V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St Mark* (London, 1953), pp. 451 f. G. Bornkamm, *Jesus von Nazareth* (Stuttgart, 1956), pp. 145 f. accepts it as an historical event.

Jesus might have raised high expectations, the more so because it happened at Easter time, the celebration of Israel's great redemption. But on that occasion Jesus acts as the humble king, and he does not proclaim his Messiahship. It may have roused the suspicion of the hierarchs, but after that he failed, the ignominious cross being his end.

The more we look into the matter, the more difficulties arise. I do not think the fact that Jesus expelled demons, which is never said of the Messiah, can be taken as an objection against his being the Messiah.³⁶ The "Son of David" Solomon was notorious for his victories over demonic powers which were still gained in his name during the N.T. period.³⁷ Would the great Son of David, the Messiah, be less powerful? But the difficulty is here that none of the expected figures, King, High Priest, Prophet, seems to suit Jesus. His crucifixion was the annulling of the claims and the inscription at the cross their derision. Yet, in spite of their disappointment, the followers of Jesus held to that name; the Resurrection was for them not the origin, but the confirmation of Messiahship.

Why was Jesus called *χριστός*? We have already observed that the translation of the original word signalizes that it was not a fossil (p. 254-5), that its etymological force was still felt. A further proof of this may be found in Acts iv 26 f.: there Psalm ii 2 "against the Lord and his Anointed" (*κατὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ*) is quoted in a prayer, and it is said that this word has been fulfilled in the passion of Jesus, "whom thou didst anoint" (*ὃν ἔχρισας*). What is meant by this action of God? The gospels do not record an actual anointing such as that of Saul and David by Samuel (1 Sam. x 1 ff.; xvi 13; 2 Sam. v 3; 1 Kings i 34). Nevertheless, we find a clear answer to our question. Luke leads us on the right track. It is obvious that he, writing as he did for "hellenists", wanted to explain this central title. According to his gospel the ministry of Jesus starts with an extensive declaration in the synagogue of his home-town: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me" (*ἔχρισέν με*, Isa. lxi 1), followed by a specification of his task (Luke iv 18 ff.); this prophetic word now becomes a reality. What Jesus proclaims and performs is possible because he has been anointed and possesses the Spirit of God. In the same line is the summary

³⁶ That point is made by Héring, *loc. cit.* p. 141.

³⁷ Josephus, *Ant.* VIII, 2, 5; E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*⁴ (Leipzig, 1909), III, 413 ff.

of Jesus' life in Acts x 38: "how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit (ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ) and with power; how he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him". These last words are not an edifying supplementation, but indicate, as I have shown elsewhere,³⁸ the active presence of the holy Spirit of God. The "anointing" is explained here by the gift of the Holy Spirit and has taken place according to Luke at the baptism (Luke iii 22; iv 1, 14). But already in the Nativity story Luke has indicated the relation between the Christ and the Spirit, because in ii 8 the birth of χριστὸς κύριος is proclaimed, but before i 35 says: "The Holy Spirit will come upon you (Mary) and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God", this Son being the future and eschatological king of David's house (i 32). Here too the connexion between the Spirit and the Anointed King is absolutely close. These texts stand at the beginning of the Gospel and of the ministry of Jesus: in that light the evangelist wants the words and actions of Jesus to be seen. And because he is endowed with the Spirit of God, he is Christ and King. Not the kingship is predominant, but the possession of the Spirit.

Is this a speciality of Lucan theology? It is well known that he lays a great stress on the Spirit,³⁹ but the answer to this question must be in the negative: it is not a later rationalization or fanciful explanation which Luke gave on his own authority. Already in the Old Testament we find this relation between "anointing" and "Spirit" and precisely with reference to kings: after his being anointed Saul prophesies (1 Sam. x 1 ff., 9 ff.), because "the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him (v. 6)"; even more striking is 1 Sam. xvi 13: "Then Samuel took the horn of oil and anointed David in the midst of his brothers; and the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David from that day forward",⁴⁰ which is explained by Josephus as prophetic (*Ant.* VI, 8, 2). That "anointing" was not always the act of pouring oil, but more an indication of making a

³⁸ W. C. van Unnik, "Dominus Vobiscum", *the Background of a Liturgical Formula*, in A. J. B. Higgins (ed.), *New Testament Essays in Memory of T. W. Manson* (Manchester, 1959), pp. 270 ff.

³⁹ H. von Baer, *Der heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (Stuttgart, 1926).

⁴⁰ Cf. J. de Fraine, *Zalving* in: *Bijbels Woordenboek*² (Roermond, 1954-7), col. 189.

prophet, seems to follow from 1 Kings xix 16 as compared with v. 19.⁴¹

In the Damascus Document 11, 12 the prophets are "those anointed with the holy Spirit".⁴² In the famous picture of the Messiah-King in the Psalms of Solomon xvii it is said about the king "the anointed of the Lord" (v. 32): "For God will make him mighty by means of (his) holy Spirit and wise by means of the spirit of understanding, with strength and righteousness".⁴³ Here the influence of Isaiah xi 2 is unmistakable: the Messianic being is endowed with the manifold workings of the Spirit. For Paul we may refer to 2 Cor. i 22 f.: *χρίσας ἡμᾶς θεὸς . . . καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος* (cf. also 1 John ii 20 ff.). It is well known that in early Christian baptismal rites the "anointing" is combined with the gift of the Spirit;⁴⁴ this combination was not made just by chance, but had a very clear meaning.

These texts may suffice to elucidate the close connexion between "Spirit" and "anointing". They also bring to light that it is found in relation with both king and prophet. But even if the connexion in the exact words is absent, the element of the Spirit in the figure of the Messiah is stressed. This dominant factor was clearly pointed out in a recent book of M. A. Chevallier.⁴⁵

In the other Gospels the *direct* connexion between "anointing" and "Spirit" is not found, but they too describe Jesus' person and work in this light. In John the declaration of John the Baptist: "I saw the Spirit descend as a dove from heaven, and it remained on him" (i 32) is soon followed by the confession of John's disciple Andrew "we have found the Messiah" (i 41); Jesus is, as it were, the embodiment of the Spirit, "for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (vii 39).⁴⁶ Matthew stresses in his first chapter that Jesus is born from the Holy Spirit (vv. 18, 20), sees in his birth the fulfilment of prophecy and trans-

⁴¹ 1 Kings xix 16—"and Elisha ... you shall anoint to be prophet in your place", but that is not told in v. 19, where it reads "Elijah passed by him and cast his mantle upon him".

⁴² For the exegesis see Van der Woude, *loc. cit.* pp. 16 ff.

⁴³ Cf. also *Ps. Sal.* XVIII, 7: "under the rod of chastening of the Lord's anointed in the fear of his God, in the spirit of wisdom and righteousness and strength".

⁴⁴ See G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London, 1951), pp. 1 ff.

⁴⁵ M. A. Chevallier, *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le bas Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1958).

⁴⁶ See my *The Purpose of St John's Gospel*, p. 405.

lates the name Emmanuel as "God with us" (v. 23).⁴⁷ In Matthew this unusual name is presumably identical with "Christ". At any rate the proper names are explained here to provide the "Leit-motif" for the whole Gospel. In Mark, as in the other Gospels, Jesus' baptism by John stands as the opening scene of the ministry. Though it is true, as has often been remarked,⁴⁸ that there are only a few references to the Spirit in the Gospels, we should not overlook the fact that the Gospels were not written as separate units, but that the evangelists have one plan, one picture in mind. For them Jesus the Christ, the Anointed with the Spirit, stood behind every word and deed.

But does this not mean that we are falling into the trap for which "Formgeschichte" has warned us? Are we not taking the Christian interpretation for the original meaning? I am fully aware of that objection. However, it is important for our investigation to see what was the essential element in the Messiahship of Jesus for these early Christians: this was *not the outward activity of a king*, but *the person possessed by the Spirit*. Therefore they could confess him as Messiah in spite of his cross. So they could also speak of him as the "Son of God". This title together with the Spirit is also connected with the baptism of Jesus: the voice combines Ps. ii 7 with Isa. xlii 1, which also contains the words: "I have put my Spirit upon him". From this side light is thrown on the famous formula, Rom. i 3-4, the Messiah was Son of David *κατὰ σάρκα* and Son of God *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης* (which was mightily manifested by his Resurrection but existed already before). *κατὰ σάρκα* and *κατὰ πνεῦμα* are two sides of the same earthly existence as elsewhere in Paul (see, for example, Rom. viii 4 ff.). This has nothing to do with "adoptianism", but everything with a right understanding of the Spirit.

Was this just an invention of Jesus' followers? Or did it rest on something in the life of Jesus? I may refer in this respect to these points which cannot reasonably be doubted and will be accepted even by the most severe "Form-critic":

1. Matt. xi 5—Jesus' answer to the question of John the Baptist: "are you he who is to come?" refers also Isa. lxi 1 (see p. 263) among other texts which describe the eschatological era; it ends

⁴⁷ Cf. my "*Dominus Vobiscum*", pp. 287 f.

⁴⁸ Cf. C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London, 1947), pp. 140 ff. and the literature mentioned there.

with: "blessed is he who takes no offence at me", because the outward appearance is not what one would expect in ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

2. Luke xi 20—"If it is by the finger of God that I cast out the demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you", for which Matt. xii 28 has "the Spirit of God". Whatever version of this logion is original, it indicates in any case that the almighty power of God works through Jesus.

3. The famous text Mark iii 21, "for they said, 'He is beside himself' ", while in v. 22 he is called "possessed by Beelzebul". It is curious that Matthew and Luke omit the actual words of Mark iii 21; they were certainly left out on purpose. But on the other hand it is striking that in John viii 48 ff. and x 20 f. Jesus is also accused of having a demon. There was something peculiar about him. His opponents see here a demonic power; his followers the Spirit of God and that was Jesus' own idea.

These undisputed facts which can in my opinion be augmented by many others show that Jesus had a peculiar spiritual power and thereby did his works. This speaks through his words with their highly authoritative character. It may seem as though we are led back to Jesus' "messianisches Selbstbewußtsein". Be that so, if it is only understood that this is not a psychological category, but according to his contemporaries a gift from God. Therefore he could be seen as a prophet. This fact, combined with this preaching of the coming Kingdom and his belonging to David's family, gave the basis for the belief that in Jesus the Anointed had come. He lacked, however, those characteristics which were first and foremost in the current conception of the Messiah. It once had dawned on Peter that he it was. But only after his condemnation on the charge of being the Messiah, which Jesus had not disputed, his followers acknowledged him as such, because the Resurrection confirmed that he was "Son of God". As in many other instances, the end revealed the true character also in the case of Jesus. The story of David showed that a long time could lie between the anointing and the actual appearance as king. After the Resurrection Jesus exercised his kingly power; his ascension was his enthronement. Jesus did not teach another conception of the Messiah, he embodied it. Because the Spirit was on him, he could be and was the Anointed, ὁ Χριστός.

The Kingdom he preached and enacted was the real communion with God, the "new covenant" of the Holy Spirit, the realization

of the promises in the Old Testament, and he was anointed to bring them. The proclamation is there not without the Proclaimer.

I hope that this paper has clarified the problem why the early Christians could take over the name of Messiah-Christ for their crucified Master who had shown none of the outward characteristics of a king during his earthly life. It has also thrown light on the decisive element, the Spirit, a conception which has received too little attention in N.T. theology and to which as one of the crucial "elements" more study should be devoted. It may also have shown where Christian confession and thinking about Jesus the Anointed One took its starting-point.

Let me end with two quotations from the N.T. which are relevant here: John xviii 36 "my kingdom is not of this world" and 1 Cor. xii 3 "no one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit".

THE CHRISTIAN'S FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT *¹

Three and a half years have passed since it pleased the Lord of life and death to take from us our dearly beloved friend and teacher Thomas Walter Manson. But the lapse of time has not effaced the impression this servant of the Lord made upon us who heard him as an inspiring teacher and masterly preacher, who listened to him as a wise counsellor and excellent speaker, who profited from his thought-provoking words in print and from the intercourse with such a fine colleague and trusty friend.

In preparing this memorial lecture I came across the prayer:

O teach me, Lord, that I may teach
The precious things Thou dost impart
And wing my words, that they may reach
The hidden depths of many a heart.

O give Thine own sweet rest to me,
That I may speak with soothing power
A word in season, as from Thee,
To weary ones in needful hour.

O fill me with Thy fulness, Lord,
Until my very heart o'erflow
In kindling thought and glowing word
Thy love to tell, Thy praise to show.

These words are, so it seemed to me, most appropriate to express the attitude in which Dr. Manson did his work. His brilliant mind was dominated by a humble heart. The study of the Bible can never be an end in itself: what is discovered by the tools of scholarship and by careful thought is received as a gift, the discovery of

* Appeared in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 44, 1962, p. 466-488.

¹ The first Manson Memorial Lecture, delivered in the University of Manchester on 28 November 1961. The Semitic background of the linguistic evidence of the expression is discussed in my paper: *De Semitische Achtergrond van ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑ in het Nieuwe Testament* in *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* afd. Letterkunde Nieuwe Reeks, deel 25 (Amsterdam, 1962), English translation in this volume p. 290-306.

God's majesty and love; as a gift which is enriched by handing it on. So taught himself, Dr. Manson was a teacher "by the grace of God" in the classroom for his pupils, in the pulpit for his congregation, as a church-leader and as a guide to young scholars. He loved solitude—and that not only for trout-fishing!—and he was at ease in a meeting. He looked relaxed and was at the same time alert, ready to listen and prepared to speak. His words were winged by the precious talents of sparkling humour and sincere earnestness.

In the last book he issued himself he wrote: "It is still true that the best propaganda for genuine Christianity is genuine Christians; and the New Testament is full of declarations of the convincing power, not of the spoken word, but of the lived life. Indeed, I think it is fair to say that the lives of the Christians will have to be the parables of the Kingdom for the twentieth century".² These words reflect in my opinion the ideal he set for himself. And as such an example he worked on many who had the privilege of meeting him. One of them is the present lecturer. During my professorial life it has been my good fortune, nay a grace of God, to come into contact with and to receive the friendship of many scholars at home and abroad who have enriched me for ever. In the first line of those ranks Tom Manson. Therefore I was deeply grateful—more than my words can express—to the trustees of this lectureship and the Faculty of Theology at this University for the honour they bestowed upon me by their invitation, an honour which is more highly appreciated since it is conferred upon one who has to enter this country by the door "For aliens".

Dr. Manson's words quoted before show a definite preference for the lived life over the spoken word. True though that be, it must be said that in him there was a harmony between the two, since he was a "minister of the Word". His work in church and university was service to the Lord whose word was made incarnate in Jesus Christ. His scholarly work, his teaching and speaking always aimed at making the Word of God audible in this generation. A Presbyterian by birth and conviction, he fulfilled his ministry in the Church Universal, the divisions of which he helped to overcome. Because he loved the *Word* with a capital "W", he respected the *words* with a small letter. In a time which brought devaluation, not only of money, but also of words, he maintained the right

² T. W. Manson, *Ministry of Priesthood, Christ's and Ours* (London, 1958), p. 21.

standard. Many people in this audience will recall the careful phrases he chose in presenting honorary graduands to this university. Though he had an easy mastery over his language, he wrote his influential contributions to *The Times* and *The Guardian* with the same painstaking care as his books and articles for learned periodicals. His studies of philosophy at Glasgow and of Semitic languages at Cambridge had trained his mind in respectful handling of words as the repositories of thought. As a "minister of the Word" in both senses Manson also devoted his labours to the preparation of the "New English Bible" and he used his bus-rides to and from the university to ponder over the exact English equivalent for a New Testament expression amidst the people for whom the translation was to be prepared. He wished to set forth the truth of God in plain—not vulgar—terms, because the mystery of God is through Jesus Christ an "open secret".

This expression "an open secret" is Manson's paraphrase of Mark viii 32,³ "παρρησία τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει", which is rendered in the NEB by "He (Jesus) spoke about it plainly". This Greek substantive "παρρησία" which literally means: "to say everything", was used for the freedom of speech which was the right of the free citizen. Later it is found as a characteristic of the relations between true friends in opposition to the feigned compliments of flatterers. In the New Testament this "παρρησία"—"outspokenness"—is found several times with special emphasis to express a particular element in the Christian attitude. By this very typical Greek word some features which were outstanding in Manson's activity as a minister of the Word are underlined. Hence it readily offered itself as a theme excellently suited to this occasion. In reflecting a characteristic side of him who gave his name to these memorial lectures it gives us at the same time the chance to avoid the danger of eulogizing and to make a small contribution to New Testament study which would be, I think, in accordance with Manson's own wish.

I must confess that it took me a long time before I formulated the somewhat mysterious title of this lecture. For this theme lacks the desired plainness. This, however, is not entirely my fault, but due to the fact that the English language has not one word to render the various shades of meaning covered by the single Greek

³ Cf. T. W. Manson, *Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret*, in D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels* (Oxford, 1955), p. 221.

noun *παρρησία* and the verb *παρρησιάζεσθαι*. This deficiency is shared by the English speech with all modern and even ancient languages. It is such a particular Greek word that it always puzzles the translator who wants to be faithful to the original and exact in bringing to light its meaning. If we consult the New English Bible, we find a great variety of renderings: plainly, boldness or bold, publicly, openly, confidence. Of course, from every language one can take examples to show that the same word gets a different meaning from its context: you make the difference between "funny" meaning "peculiar" and "funny" meaning "amusing" and know that "going Dutch" is not identical with a "Dutch walk". This fact makes the study of semantics so fascinating but also sets the task to the interpreter of displaying the full array of associations evoked by the original in order to see whether there is loss or gain. But after due consideration of various possibilities I choose this word "freedom of speech", because so the connection with speaking, so closely marked in the N.T., is kept and in the adjective "Christian" we try to formulate the special character the word gets in the N.T.

The first scholar who devoted his massive learning to elucidate the history of this word, was the German Erik Peterson, who gave a marvellous sketch of the stages through which the word went.⁴ But it was only an outline and the larger monograph he promised was never published. The data from the N.T. were dealt with in a rather perfunctory manner. Far more thorough in this respect was the treatment in Schlier's contribution to Kittel's famous *Wörterbuch*.⁵ In this case, however, the sequence of the subdivisions (viz. John, Acts, Paul, Hebrews) calls for some criticism, because this order tends to obscure the possible development of the word within the Christian community. Moreover, Schlier leaves aside the question whether there was a special reason for certain N.T. authors to use *this* word. Two more studies in French on *παρρησία* appeared in 1957 and 1958. In the former Jaeger dealt with it as the background

⁴ E. Peterson, *Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte von ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑ* in: Reinhold Seeberg—*Festschrift* (Leipzig, 1929), pp. 283-297.

⁵ H. Schlier, *παρρησία*, in G. Kittel-G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart, 1954), v. 885-95; see also P. Jouön, *Divers sens de παρρησία dans le Nouveau Testament, Recherches de Science Religieuse*, xxx (1940), 239-41; H. Windisch, *Exkurs ad 2 Cor. iii 12, Der zweite Korintherbrief* (Göttingen, 1924) ad 2 Cor. iii 12, p. 118 f., and O. Michel, *Der Hebräerbrief* (Göttingen, 1949), ad Heb. iii 6, p. 99 f.

of the specific usage of "fiducia" in Christian Latin; he stressed the juridical aspect, given in the covenant relation with God;⁶ in the latter a Belgian scholar D. Smolders focused his attention on the texts in Acts and St. Paul; according to him the word must have been current in the primitive community, especially in relation with persecutions; it expressed the apostolic "audacity" before men and the assurance before God.⁷ My own observations lead me into a somewhat different direction and this fact makes it worthwhile to discuss the word afresh.

It will have struck you that so far no English contribution has been mentioned. This unpleasant fact is true. Except for some casual remarks in commentaries no attention has been given to this noun either in an article or monograph; one can only refer to the articles on "Boldness" in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* and his *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*,⁸ which have now reached the venerable age of fifty years and are somewhat one-sided; Scott leaves out the testimony of Acts. So it is not complete boldness to take this topic for this lecture and though I dare not promise to fill the gap, I hope at least to give some insight into the typical character of this word in the N.T.

Was this idea neglected just by an oversight, or because it was not sufficiently important? It must have been an oversight, because *παρρησία* has played an important part both in the pagan Greek world and among the Christians. It is fairly frequent in the N.T. and of prime importance in the vocabulary of the spiritual life among the Church fathers; it was taken over by the Syrians in transliteration and is a favourite idea in a mystic like Isaac of Nineveh.⁹

The word is first met in the Greek political sphere;¹⁰ it describes the right of the free citizen to express his opinion in the assembly of the city. Schlier points out that it had three aspects: the right to say everything; the plain truth; the courage to declare one's

⁶ H. Jaeger, *παρρησία et fiducia* in: K. Aland-F. L. Cross (eds.), *Studia Patristica* (Berlin, 1957), i. 225 ff.

⁷ D. Smolders, *L'audace de l'apôtre selon St. Paul, le thème de la parrêsia*, *Collectanea Mechliniensia* (Louvain, 1958), pp. 16-30, 117-33.

⁸ D. Russell Scott, *Boldness (Christian)*, in J. Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (Edinburgh, 1909), ii 785-6; T. Nicoll, *Boldness*, in J. Hastings, *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church* (Edinburgh, 1915), i. 156-7.

⁹ Cf. A. J. Wensinck, *Mystic Treatises by Isaac of Nineveh* (Amsterdam, 1923), index s.v.

¹⁰ The material for this paragraph is taken from Schlier, *loc. cit.* pp. 869 ff.

conviction. In the private sphere it denoted that free intercourse between friends who speak the truth and do not flatter one another. In the N.T. period this attitude was still highly valued though it had lost much of its political connotations, since the city-state had lost its importance; "freedom of speech" tended to get an unfavourable meaning, because it was one of the highest ideals of the Cynic philosophers who with great insolence hurled their invectives against everybody.

In Jewish-Hellenistic writers like Philo and Josephus this word is taken over but here it is striking to see that *παρρησία* is also used in relation with God; the friend of God like Moses, the example of wisdom, possesses it. A good conscience, bound by the will of God as expressed in His law, is the ground for this freedom.

In this connection we may remark that this *παρρησία*, though found in the Septuagint, does not belong to the same class as words like *ἐκκλησία*, *ἅγιος*, *διαθήκη*, *διασπορά*, which went over into the N.T. vocabulary stamped by a specific "Hebrew" imprint. It is only found a few times in the Greek Old Testament, only once in the Pentateuch, mostly in later Wisdom-books. But one cannot say that it is a central idea in the religious terminology of the O.T., either in the Law or Prophets and Psalms. Even in the sapiential literature it turns up very rarely, and an author like Sirach does not give special instructions on this topic as he does in other instances. Viewed in the whole context of the Septuagint it is a marginal feature. There is no indication whatsoever that it directly influenced the N.T. usage, not even texts like Wisdom v 1 and 4 Macc. iv 10.

But is it correct to say with Russell Scott that the application in the N.T. stands quite apart and that it is "a new ingredient put into the religious consciousness by Christianity"? The witness of Philo and Josephus makes this an unwarranted statement. It is true that this "freedom of speech" was not used by the Greeks in their relation to the Gods, but it is equally true that it was done by Philo and Josephus. And these authors do not give long explanations as though they were doing something unheard of. Within the Jewish synagogues no objection was felt to the use of this term with regard to God, strange though it might have sounded to Greek ears. A more thorough investigation of the religious thought of Philo and Josephus would be required for a real evaluation of their testimony. There is still an open question here, even after

Peterson's and Schlier's observations. A common Greek word is taken over without much ado by the Jewish synagogues and applied even to the relation with God.

When we now turn to the New Testament, we notice a very remarkable increase of instances as compared with the Septuagint.¹¹ The N.T. outnumbers the O.T. not only relatively, but also absolutely. This fact indicates that "freedom of speech" has some predominance here. Another remarkable feature comes to light, if we look at the distribution over the various books: 1 instance in Mark; 9 in John; 12 in Acts (+ 4 not very important variants); 10 in Paul (with inclusion of Pastoral Epistles); 4 in Hebrews; 4 in 1 John. This list calls for some remarks: (a) the word does not belong to the vocabulary of a single author, but is fairly evenly distributed over at least four writers; (b) it is typical that the three Synoptics yield one instance only, while John is well-represented; (c) though it is never safe to argue from silence it is strange that Luke lacks the word in the parallel-passage to the text of Mark, while on the other hand he uses the word so frequently in Acts.

a) The first occurrence of the word in Christian literature is in one of the oldest letters of Paul, in 1 Thess. ii 2. The apostle reminds his readers of his first appearance among them. After his bitter experience in Philippi he came to them; but these sufferings did not prevent him from starting afresh in Thessalonica. The words concerned are translated in R.S.V. like this: "we had courage in our God to declare to you the Gospel of God in the face of great opposition", and in N.E.B. by: "we declared the gospel of God to you frankly and fearless by the help of our God. A hard struggle it was". This example shows how difficult is the translation of the sentence ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν λαλῆσαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ. Both sides are contained in this "freedom of speech": he took courage (ingressive aorist) in spite of the bitter opposition, and he preached the gospel quite plainly, as appears from the sequel: without guile, flattery or greed (verses 3 ff.). Undoubtedly Paul is reacting here against all sorts of religious propagandists of his day. His preaching does not aim at pleasing men, not even himself, but pleasing God: his gospel is not "according to man" (Gal. i 11) and therefore provokes opposition; but he has

¹¹ Only one instance—and that *in malam partem*—is known so far.

not adulterated the gospel. The word "freedom of speech" has here its place in the missionary-practice of the apostle: it comprises both the full truth of the gospel and full freedom towards the judgement of men. This freedom Paul took from God Himself, who was the author of the gospel, and not from his own valour.

In 2 Corinthians the word is used twice. In vii 4 the translation: "I am perfectly frank with you" (N.E.B.) is preferable to the rendering: "I have great confidence in you".¹² In the strained relations which existed between Paul and the Christians in Corinth and of which chapters x-xii give a moving picture, Paul finds the freedom to speak to them in all frankness and urges the Corinthians not to close their hearts; they are more than friends, joined together in death and life. The deepest motive for this frankness is revealed in the famous passage iii 12 ff. Paul had to defend his apostleship against all sorts of attacks: "for we are not, like so many, peddlers of God's word; but as men of sincerity, as commissioned by God, in the sight of God we speak in Christ" (ii 17). He is a minister of the New Covenant, which surpasses in glory the old one. Then he continues: "with such a hope as this we speak out boldly" and this statement is elucidated by a curious, not to say puzzling, passage about the veil over Moses' face, the length of which is proof of the importance Paul attached to it. Elsewhere I have tried to demonstrate that the key to this passage lies in the fact that in Aramaic the expression "uncovering of the face" is identical with *παρρησία*¹³—an expression the apostle himself uses in verse 18. For our understanding of what Paul means here by "freedom of speech" it is significant that he uses it in his relations with the Christians as a true apostle, because the veil is taken away and he sees or reflects the glory of God; he has an insight into God's new and eternal relation with men; he is free, guided by the Spirit. Here again we see that the idea has its place in Paul's activity as a preacher of the gospel and is based on the revelation of the gospel itself.

A typical example of this "frankness" between Christians is found in Philemon 8. Paul, who according to worldly standards is

¹² *παρρησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, where *πρὸς* clearly indicates the direction in which the *παρρησία* goes, but not the foundation for the *παρρησία*.

¹³ "With unveiled Face", *An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians* III 12-18, *Nov. Test.* vi 1963, p. 153-169, *Sparsa Collecta* I, p. 194-210.

far inferior to the wealthy Philemon, and is in prison, is bold enough to give orders to Philemon to do his duty, but he refrains from that right; here again the "freedom of speech" Paul enjoys is "in Christ".

This "freedom of speech" is directed towards the proclamation of the Gospel. It is not a quality of Paul himself. In the dangers of his imprisonment he asks for the intercessions of his brethren that it may be given to him. The wonderful secret of God's work must be set forth in complete openness. See Ephesians vi 19-20: "pray also for me, that utterance may be given me in opening my mouth boldly to proclaim the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in chains, that I may declare it boldly, as I ought to speak". Here *παρρησιάζομαι* is more than courage, it is directly bound up with the proclamation of the mystery, as appears from the parallel in Colossians iv 4: "that I may make the mystery of Christ clear (*φανερώσω*),¹⁴ as I ought to speak".

In the same vein we must, I think, interpret Ephesians iii 12: "Christ Jesus, in whom we have *παρρησία* and the access with confidence through our faith in Him". This is often taken in the sense of our "freedom of speech" in approaching God, under the influence of ii 18, "access to the Father". But the whole preceding passage speaks of something different. In glowing terms the prisoner Paul praises the great office which was entrusted to him: to proclaim the mystery which is now revealed, that the Gentiles become full members of God's own people. Even in his chains and sufferings he is able to tell forth that wonderful message. In Christ Jesus that mystery has been revealed and therefore in Him Paul can make it clear, the whole church can proclaim it and enter into that reality of the people of God.¹⁵ Here again, the ground for this "freedom of speech" is in Jesus Christ.

A very curious use of the term is found in Philippians i 20. Paul is in prison for the sake of the gospel; the outcome of his trial is uncertain, but nevertheless he is of good cheer, for by the prayers of the faithful and the help of the Spirit "this will turn out for (his) deliverance" and then he continues: "as it is my eager expectation and hope that I shall not be at all ashamed, but that in all openness

¹⁴ Is that a translation of גללה? Cf. p. 284.

¹⁵ Therefore he adds verse 13: "So I ask you not to lose heart over what I am suffering for you which is your glory", which brings the whole passage iii 1 ff. to a close.

now as always Christ will be honoured in my body". The opposite to *παρρησία* clearly is "to be ashamed", of course in the tribulations and even danger of death. But Paul suddenly makes a very striking change in the sentence. One would have expected: "but that in all openness I shall honour Christ", viz. in the clear witness he gives; but all of a sudden Christ becomes the subject and Paul is nothing but the instrument in which the greatness of Christ shines out. In the weakness of his body is revealed the power of Jesus Christ (cf. 2 Cor. xii 10, Phil. iv 13). In him Christ lives (Gal. ii 20), and Jesus Christ will clearly show His glory either in the life or in the death of His servant. Therefore I have translated *παρρησία* here by "openness", because not the courage of the martyr, but Christ Himself will be revealed in all plainness. But as will be seen from the context in this chapter the notion of "freedom of speech" and sincerity in the proclamation of the gospel is not absent (cf. verse 14: "most of the brethren have been made confident in the Lord because of my imprisonment, and are much more bold to speak the word of God without fear"; ¹⁶ verse 18 "in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed").¹⁷ By the sudden turn of subject Paul brings out what is the real power of "freedom of speech", the fact that not only the gospel is simply proclaimed, but that the Lord of the gospel is revealed.

In Colossians ii 15 Paul says that God has disarmed the principalities and powers and made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them in Christ. The same verb *δειγματίζω* is used in Matthew i 19 ¹⁸ of an adulteress who is disgraced by exposure. This happens *ἐν παρρησίᾳ* so that the poor nature of these powers who had enslaved mankind is revealed before all eyes!

The last text in the Pauline letters, 1 Timothy iii 13, is very obscure.¹⁹ Of the deacons it is said that they who serve well "gain a good standing for themselves and also much freedom of speech in the faith which is in Christ Jesus". The most probable interpre-

¹⁶ περισσοτέρως τολμᾶν ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖν.

¹⁷ See verses 15-18: "Some indeed preach Christ from envy and rivalry, but others from good will. The latter do it out of love, knowing that I am put here for the defense of the Gospel; the former proclaim Christ out of partisanship, not sincerely but thinking to afflict me in my imprisonment".

¹⁸ The imagery of this verse is far from clear as may be seen from the commentaries *ad loc.*

¹⁹ See the discussion in C. Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales* (Paris, 1947), *ad loc.*

tation in my opinion is that the good service confirms by its deeds the word of the gospel. He may openly profess the faith because his conduct is his recommendation.

In surveying these Pauline texts we see that "freedom of speech" is never mentioned in connection with virtues, not even among the gifts of the Spirit in Galatians v. There is no connection with friendship.²⁰ It is very closely linked with the preaching of the Gospel, with the open proclamation of the divine Mystery, or the divine triumph. Adverse powers are not able to stop this proclamation, but on the contrary they stimulate it. This evangelical freedom of speech shows the message crystal-clear, without admixture; it gives an open character to the relation of the apostle with his fellow-Christians. So *παρηγορία* is a characteristic element of his ministry.²¹

b) "Freedom of speech" has a prominent place in Acts. Everyone perusing its pages will see that the noun and the verb often recur in all parts of the book, so that it may be styled one of the "key-words".²² It is the last word that resounds in our ears when we close the book: Paul in Rome "was preaching the Kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus quite openly (*μετὰ πάσης παρηγορίας*), unhindered". It is closely connected with the proclamation of the gospel; it denotes the freedom with which it is proclaimed by him who himself is there on trial. It is, however, not the profession in the law-court, but the missionary activity that is carried out with all clearness and without outward hindrance.

It is necessary to see the various contexts in which this "freedom of speech" is applied. In chap. iv Peter and John are tried before the Jewish council because they have healed a man in the name of Jesus, as they had explained to the crowd. Before the Sanhedrin Peter is mocking at the fact that they are tried because of a healing and gives a plain witness about Jesus, whom the Jews had rejected but who is the exclusive Saviour. "Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were uneducated, common men, they wondered". This freedom of speech was conspicuous, the more so since the apostles are uneducated. Is it only

²⁰ It is striking, as Professor Dr. J. N. Sevenster pointed out some time ago, that Paul who had friends does not speak about friendship.

²¹ Of course 1 Tim. iii 13 is slightly different (is it Pauline?).

²² W. C. van Unnik, *The "Book of Acts" the Confirmation of the Gospel*, *Novum Testamentum* IV (1960), pp. 35 f., *Sparsa Collecta* I 340-373.

said because these common people are not impressed by the authority of the Sanhedrin? Is it insolence? No, this freedom manifests itself in fearless speaking, but also and mainly in the clear witness about Jesus, who had been rejected by this very same council and yet was the exclusive Saviour. This freedom gives the explanation of the miracle that had taken place.

In the same line lies Acts iv 29, 31. This is not simply a prayer for courage, though the disciples ask for strength against the threats that are imminent. Why are they in danger? Because they speak about Jesus the Messiah. Here again the connection with the wonder-working power of God is mentioned. The Christians are in need of the gift of "freedom of speech"; that means, of speaking the word of God quite plainly, not frightened by the opposition of the forces against God and His Anointed. This prayer is granted by the Holy Spirit with which they are filled.²³

Very striking is also the description in Acts ix 27, 29. Barnabas tells the disciples in Jerusalem about the conversion of Paul "and how at Damascus he had preached with freedom of speech in the name of Jesus". This refers to verse 22: Paul filled with the Holy Spirit (verse 17), proclaimed in the synagogues Jesus as the Son of God or the Christ (cf. also verse 22), confounding the Jews. This same work Paul continues to do in Jerusalem: "preaching with freedom of speech in the name of the Lord. And he spoke and disputed against the Hellenists". In both cases this preaching enrages the Jews who want to kill Paul. The great dispute here is about the Messiahship of Jesus, the stumbling-block for the Jews because of Jesus' earthly appearance and crucifixion, but the very heart of the Christian faith. This witness does not begin in the dangerous situation; it precedes, it creates dangers because of unbelief on the part of the Jews.

In Acts it is typical that this *παρρησία* is always mentioned in connection with preaching in the synagogues and to the Jews. For example in xiii 46, after the long sermon on God's way with Israel's history and the mission of Jesus, the Jews "contradicted what was spoken by Paul" and blasphemed. Then "Paul and Barnabas said with freedom of speech: 'It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken first to you. Since you thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, behold, we turn to the Gentiles' ". These verses must be seen in contrast with the end of

²³ *N.B.* the imperfect ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (verse 31).

the preceding sermon, which closes with an appeal to conversion and a warning given in a word from the prophet Habakkuk.²⁴ Now the hearers have made their decision; the prophetic word is no longer an oracle for the future, but a reality in the present. The apostles make clear what the way of God is, His plan of salvation for the world.

In other instances, too, "freedom of speech" is mentioned in the context of preaching in the synagogues.²⁵ Even where Greeks are mentioned, as in xiv 1, they are not pure pagans, but Gentiles living in a rather close relation to the synagogue, the so-called "God-fearers". Highly interesting in this respect is Acts xxvi 26, occurring in the defence of Paul before Festus and Agrippa. The apology tells the story of Paul's conversion and ends up with the testimony from Moses and the prophets "that the Christ must suffer, and that by being the first to rise from the dead, he would proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles". The heathen Festus calls this sheer madness, but the apostle appeals to the king as an expert on Jewish matters: "For the king knows about these things, and to him I speak freely . . . King Agrippa, do you believe the prophets?". Here again we find the connection with the O.T. scriptures, and the testimony about Jesus Christ; the "freedom of speech" is directed to somebody who is considered a Jew.

In the light of later usage of the word in the "Acts of the Martyrs",²⁶ it is remarkable that "freedom of speech" is never

²⁴ *παρρησία* in connection with a scripture-text also in Acts ii 29. After quoting Ps. xvi 8 ff, Peter says: "Brethren, I may say to you with freedom of speech of the patriarch David that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us to this day"; here it means: openly, without hiding the truth.

²⁵ Acts xiv 1: "Now at Iconium they entered together into the Jewish synagogue, and so spoke that a great company believed, both of Jews and of Greeks. (2) But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles and poisoned their minds against the brethren. (3) So they remained for a long time, speaking with freedom of speech for the Lord, who bore witness to the word of his grace, granting signs and wonders to be done by their hands". Here again miracles are connected with the *παρρησία*. Acts xix 8: "And (Paul) entered the synagogue (of Ephesus) and for three months spoke with freedom of speech, arguing and pleading about the kingdom of God", a passage which must be read in the light of Acts xvii 2-3: "And Paul went in (into the synagogue), as was his custom, and for three weeks he argued with them from the Scriptures, explaining and proving that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead, and saying: 'This Jesus, whom I proclaim to you, is the Christ' ". Acts xviii 26: Apollos, fervent in spirit, "began to speak with freedom of speech in the synagogue".

²⁶ Cf. Schlier, *loc. cit.* p. 883 f.

mentioned in Acts in the context of Paul's preaching to the Gentiles or in the long story of his trial (chap. xxii ff.; except xxvi 26 discussed before). The texts do not permit to speak about this *παρρησία* in the context of persecution (so Smolders). It is not so much the opposition which provokes the "freedom of speech" on the side of the Christians, but their *παρρησία* which provokes opposition and danger. This "freedom of speech" is always connected with "speaking the word of God", the testimony about the Messiah, Crucified and Risen, with a plain explanation of the prophecies and God's way of salvation. By God's Spirit and His miracles the apostles are specially equipped for this task. It is remarkable that this "freedom of speech" always appears in the contacts of the apostles with the Jews (even in chap. xxviii the relation of Paul with the Jews is the main theme). Is there a link here with Paul's exposition in 2 Corinthians iii 12 ff.? It is not possible to give a clear-cut positive answer, but I for one would not exclude the possibility of such a connection.

Another question to be raised here is: why did Luke not use this word in his gospel, whereas he so frequently employed it in Acts? In other cases, e.g. that of the verb "to save", he has the word in both works and he even introduced it various times into his former book where the tradition in the other Synoptists lacks it.²⁷ And this fact is even more striking since Mark had it! After the first announcement of the sufferings of the Son of Man, following Peter's famous confession, Mark viii 32 reads: *καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει*, "and openly he spoke the word". Mark's terminology recalls that of the early church;²⁸ as in Acts *παρρησία* is linked up with speaking (*λαλεῖν*). Unfortunately Luke did not account for his treatment of older traditions—or is it a happy circumstance, because it keeps a part of New Testament scholarship alive? Did he not find this word in his tradition about Caesarea Philippi? Or did he leave it out on purpose, because this "freedom of speech" could only properly be used after Jesus' cross and resurrection? See Luke xxiv 26 f., 44 ff. Then it may be an indication that Luke considered the word about the suffering of the Son of Man as enigmatic, only revealed in the events of Jesus' life.²⁹ On the other

²⁷ See my article, mentioned in note 13.

²⁸ J. Jeremias, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Göttingen, 1956), p. 65.

²⁹ Luke has not the scene about Peter rebuking Jesus for uttering this word.

hand, it is clear that in Mark *παρρησία* does not mean "in public", because it is only for the intimate group of his disciples; it is Jesus' open declaration of the rejection of the "Son of Man" and is an indication of His coming fate.³⁰

When we consider the use of "freedom of speech" in the later "Acts of the Martyrs" it is noteworthy that the evangelists do not use it in connection with passages on confession such as Matthew x 17 ff.: "they will deliver you up to councils, and flog you in their synagogues; and you will be dragged before governors and kings for my sake, to bear testimony before them and the Gentiles. When they deliver you up, do not be anxious how you are to speak . . . for it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father speaking through you" (and parallels). One would have expected it here. Is this a sign that the word did not belong to the vocabulary of Jesus which was carefully transmitted? Or had the word undergone a change and was it mainly connected with the "revelation" of the gospel-message?

The editions of Nestle and Kilpatrick offer four variant readings in Acts where *παρρησία* is introduced:

1. Acts vi 10: "the Jews could not withstand the wisdom and the Spirit with which (Stephen) spoke", which becomes in some mss. "the Holy Spirit because they were refuted by him with all freedom of speech".

2. Acts ix 20: after "he proclaimed" some witnesses add "with all freedom of speech", cf. verse 27.

3. Acts xiv 19: instead of "persuaded the people" some manuscripts read "and when the apostles argued with freedom of speech, they persuaded"; cf. xvii 2, etc.

4. Acts xvi 4 the first words in some texts read: "As they went on their way through the cities they proclaimed with all freedom of speech the Lord Jesus Christ".

These variants have very slight attestation and cannot claim to be original. They are in complete accordance with the contents of *παρρησία* we found elsewhere in Acts. They stress the importance of this idea even more than in the ordinary text.

c) Let us now turn to the Fourth Gospel. In contrast with the Synoptics John uses the word *παρρησία* quite frequently, practically

³⁰ Is it important that Matt. xvi 21 has *δεικνύειν* instead of *διδάσκειν* in Mark viii 31? Does this express some kind of revealing?

always in connection with something Jesus said or did. The texts are not in the first six chapters but occur after vii 4, which may be significant, since all have to do with Judea and Jesus' revelation in the heart of Judaism.

In vii 3 f. Jesus' brethren want Him to go up to Judea to show His works there, for, so they say, "no man works in secret, if he seeks to be known openly (ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι). If you do these things (namely His works as a revelation of the Father and testimony to Himself as the Christ), show yourself to the world". The "world" has in John a very interesting meaning; in several places it is identical with the Jewish world (xv 18-xvi 2; xviii 20). Here the *παρρησία* is contrasted with something hidden, but it is more "to be known openly", not only as an object of talk, but as a person who is not *incognito*, on the contrary, whose true nature is open before all. Therefore the brethren say: "show yourself" (φανερώσον)—an interesting transition with behind it perhaps the Hebrew (Aramaic) גלל to uncover, to reveal.³¹ Jesus' person forms the subject of discussion among the Jews (vii 12 f.); they whisper about him, because no one dared to speak about Him openly "for fear of the Jews",³² which amounts here to "openly confess Him" (cf. ix 22). Later on in this chapter they are astonished over Jesus' teaching, not so much over its contents as about the fact that He speaks with freedom of speech, although He is not trained as a rabbi³³ and is threatened with death; they conclude that He is not the Christ. But this again leads to a declaration on the part of Jesus about His person, about the One Who sent Him and His authority. John often uses words with a double meaning;³⁴ here we meet such a case, for *παρρησία* is to be understood as "in public" and "revealing". In x 24 the Jews urge Jesus to give a clear declaration about His Messiahship; Jesus refers to what He has said and done, which has met with unbelief. Here the word *παρρησία* means an unequivocal answer to the question whether Jesus is the Christ, which Jesus had not given in plain words.

When asked in the trial before Annas about His disciples and

³¹ In vii 4 the contrast is ἐν κρυπτῷ—ἐν παρρησίᾳ; in vii 10 οὐ φανερώς, ἀλλὰ ὥς ἐν κρυπτῷ which seems very closely parallel.

³² An often-recurring theme in John, see also ix 22, xii 42, xix 38, xx 6.

³³ See vii 15 and cf. Acts iv 13.

³⁴ O. Cullmann, *Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des 4. Evangeliums*, *Theologische Zeitschrift*, iv (1948), 360-72.

teaching Jesus answered: "I have spoken openly to the world; I have always taught in synagogues and in the temple, where all the Jews come altogether; I have nothing said secretly . . . Ask those who have heard me, what I said to them". Here again the contrast exists between "openly" and "in secret". This is the summary of His activity. Even if sometimes He spoke to His disciples in riddles,³⁵ He always made His meaning clear. He has declared Himself the Son of God, the One sent by the Father who works with the authority of His Father. He taught openly though for a while He did hide Himself before the last revelation, His entrance into Jerusalem as the king who died for His people.³⁶ Then His hour had come (vii 6).

Some years ago I argued that the Fourth Gospel was a missionary writing, addressed to the Jews to bring them to believe that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God.³⁷ Within the scope of this purpose the idea of *παρησία* has its place; its centre is Jesus Himself. His words are not cryptic, but reveal His unity with the Father, the nature of His person. But this "openness" must be accepted in faith. It is typical that on several occasions the unbelievers ask for it and Jesus' answer refers to His works which are His testimony. This freedom may be hindered through fear of the unbelieving Jews; even Jesus Himself retired sometimes for this reason, though this was so that he would be ready for the great manifestation, when the hour had come.

This freedom of speech and action as manifested in the earthly life of Jesus is not a quality of man, but is concerned with the revelation of God. It makes plain that Jesus is in this way the Christ, the Son who must be believed so that men may have life eternal.

d) In the Epistle to the Hebrews we have quite a different situation. This admonition is addressed to Christians who are in

³⁵ See John xi 14: after the word about Lazarus' sleep (verse 11). He told them plainly: "Lazarus is dead", xvi 25: "I have said this to you in figures; the hour is coming when I shall no longer speak to you in figures, but tell you plainly of the Father . . . 29 His disciples said: 'Ah, now you are speaking plainly, not in any figure' ". The difficulties in these verses in chap. xvi—see the commentaries *ad. loc.*—are not of importance for our discussion.

³⁶ See John xi 54: "Jesus therefore no longer went about openly among the Jews, but went from there to the country near the wilderness" after the decision of the Jewish council to kill Him (xi 47 ff.) and before the decisive days described in chap. xii-xx.

³⁷ W. C. van Unnik, *The Purpose of St. John's Gospel*, in *Studia Evangelica*, Berlin 1959, now in *Sparsa Collecta* I 35-63.

danger of apostasy, because their faith is flagging and the outward oppression heavy. The author tries to keep them back by reminding them of the fearful majesty of God and the unique and final way He has given to be in communion with Him. This epistle is a warning, the negative side of which is outshone by the positive one, the incomparable gift of God's grace in His Son Jesus Christ. In Him the way foreshadowed in the O.T. revelation was opened once for all.

In this context the author mentions the idea of *παρρησία* four times, and it is a significant element, as may be seen from the fact that it appears twice in the passage which deals with the concrete situation (x 19, 35). Sometimes the word is taken here as "courage", "confidence". That makes perfectly good sense in iv 16: "Let us then with confidence draw near to the throne of grace", and x 35: "do not throw away your confidence". But it is something more than a human virtue.

In x 19 the author is drawing the conclusion from a long argument in which he has pointed out that the sacrifices of the O.T. were insufficient to establish the right relation with God and to take sin away definitely, but that Jesus accomplished it with His own sacrifice and established the New Covenant, promised by the prophets. The *παρρησία* is here in contrast with the symbols and shadows of the O.T. and the liberty created by the removal of sins. Because by the open declaration of God in His promises and in Jesus' sacrifice there is no hindrance, the Christians have the free right to enter; they can do so with a good conscience, not because they are not aware of misdeeds, but because they have been cleansed. The author urges them to use this right and to profess their Christian hope amidst the surrounding dangers. Then they are the house of God by holding fast this right and open confession, firm to the end (iii 6). Because the Christians have a sympathizing High Priest they can go with freedom to the throne of grace to receive help in their distress (iv 16). The difficulties which the readers are now encountering are not a new experience; in the first ardour of their faith they had taken their sufferings with joy (x 32 ff.). They could bear them because they knew of the reality of God's promises. Therefore they must not throw away their *παρρησία* which has so great a reward in the future, eternal communion with God (x 35). Here it is, so to say, the content of the Christian attitude in the world, the security of God's salvation and the open confession

amidst of opposition. This last instance is an interesting illustration of the rule that the same words have not always the same meaning. In the Greek rhetor Dio Chrysostom we find, as Moffatt pointed out, the very same expression; but here it is the free right of citizens in a political sense.³⁸

In Hebrews the "freedom of speech" has two sides: the free right to approach God, given in the sacrifice of Christ, which is the essence of the Christian faith, and the open confession of this faith, which is an unshakable hope. These two sides are an inseparable unity. In the situation in which the Christians live they need it as a gift and a task.

e) The critical situation in 1 John is different from that in Hebrews. The pressure does not come from the outside, but from within the church itself. False teachings about Jesus Christ as the Son of God try to find adherents. The ever-recurring theme is "Abide in Jesus Christ"; in Him the Father has given His perfect love so that men for whom Christ is an expiation are children of God. The test for abiding in Him is the fulfilment of His commandments.

In this relatively short letter the word *παρησία* occurs four times and always indicates the assurance of man in his relation to God. Twice it appears in connection with eschatology (ii 28, iv 17); in the day of the Last Judgement the Christian will not be ashamed nor fear before Almighty God. This "freedom of speech" is present, because he is in Christ the Expiator, filled with perfect love which drives away fear. But for the Christian the judgement is not only future, but present; love towards the brethren is the test for abiding in the love of Christ. If we have not a bad conscience in that respect (iii 11 ff.) because we love in deed and truth, we have "freedom of speech" towards God and may ask Him everything (iii 21). This is again stressed in v 14: because we have that freedom and know that He hears us, we must pray for the remission of sins of our brethren. This free intercourse with God, which His children abiding in Christ enjoy, has an immediate practical consequence. It has its foundation in Christ, is here now, and will

³⁸ J. Moffatt, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1924), ad Heb. x 35; he refers to Dio Chrysostom, *Oratio* xxxiv 39, *δέδοικα μὴ τελέως ἀποβάλλετε τὴν παρησίαν* = to lose the right of free speech as citizens of Tarsus, if they allow themselves to be maltreated by the governors.

be in the final judgement: "freedom of speech" in the children of God who are in His love and show forth love.

It is striking that this conception of *παρρησία* is completely different from that in the gospel. There it was always used with regard to the revelation and was a "freedom of speech" towards men; here it is directed towards God. There it was never eschatological; here it is the expression of the most intimate relation between God and man, now and for the future, even in the critical day of judgement. Here "freedom of speech" is not found in the wise who has a good conscience, but in everyone who is cleansed by Jesus Christ.

1 John stands apart in this respect and leads over to later usage in which freedom of speech is the characteristic attitude of Christian prayer.

The Christian's freedom of speech as it appears in the N.T. has a variety of meanings. It is used for the work of Christ in John, the preaching of the gospel in Acts, the activity of the apostle in Paul, the security of the faith in Hebrews, assurance before God in 1 John. It is remarkable that in John and Acts the word is applied to the relation with the Jews. "Freedom of speech" with all its variety of meanings is, however, always based on the revelation of God in Jesus Christ who restored the relation between God and man. That is the issue at stake in John; that is the message the apostles bring; that is the basis for the attitude in Hebrews and 1 John. In spite of the opposition of those who are unbelievers, of those who criticize the apostle, the Christian may speak freely because he knows Him who conquers all opposition, because he knows that wonderful communion with God which transcends everything in the world.

The Christians took over in their vocabulary a word common in Greek. But they were not proud to have this right as free citizens, these slaves and poor; not even the Roman citizen Paul used it in that connection. It was not characteristic for them as friends, but as brethren who shared in the revelation of God's love. When they used "free speech", they had not the pride of the Cynics who wanted to show their independence by reviling other people; they used it to bring to light the open mystery of God.

This "freedom of speech" makes it clear that Christianity was not a mystery-religion, revelling in hidden secrets and allegories.

Its message was on the contrary one of the revelation of the mystery. God had done His deed, fulfilled His promises in Jesus Christ, in whom the way to God and to men is opened by love. The message is given in plain words.

Sometimes in N.T. scholarship it seems as though there was an unbridgeable gulf between the Hebrew and Greek elements and that in explaining the N.T. one has to choose between them. Our treatment of this word *παρησία* may have shown that this is a wrong way of putting the question. Here we have a typically Greek word with very little background in Judaism; it has been taken up by the Christians and made subservient to the Gospel.

This "freedom of speech" is made possible, because God has spoken decisively in Jesus Christ; it is the joyful gift and task for the Christian to proclaim thereby the message plainly, to converse thereby with his fellow-Christians openly, to speak thereby to his Father simply.

An example of this Christian "freedom of speech" we have met in our friend Tom Manson. It was a very high honour to be invited to deliver this lecture, the first to be devoted to his memory. I wish to thank the Trustees and the Theological Faculty for this opportunity of expressing my deep and lasting gratitude for what Manson as a scholar and a friend gave me by his example.

"The memory of the righteous is a blessing".

THE SEMITIC BACKGROUND OF ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT*

The familiar law by which not only books, but also words and ideas, have a fate of their own, is clearly illustrated by the case I am about to discuss in this paper: *παρρησία* in the New Testament.

Well before this word, which is usually translated as "freedom of speech", "boldness", or "frankness", "confidence", but which can sometimes also be rendered as "openly" or "freely", became part of Christian usage—and this, judging from 1 Thess. ii 2 had happened by about 50 A.D.—it had a history of several centuries behind it. In a short but comprehensive essay Erik Peterson traced its development at the time.¹ It originated in the sphere of the Athenian popular assemblies where each free citizen had the right to "say-all". Later, it played its part in the mutual relationship between friends who "told" each other "everything" as opposed to toadying to one another like flatterers; and finally, as a brutal frankness, it became the highest virtue of the Cynic philosophers. It is characteristic that this word should appear but seldom in the Greek translation of the Old Testament and that it should not, there, have received a specifically Jewish imprint. In Hellenistic-Jewish writers like Philo and Josephus, on the other hand, it is very common, although they tend to use it to mean "boldness" or "confidence", along Greek lines. There is, however, one remarkable exception to this rule: they also use the word about man's relationship with God—something we never encounter in secular Greek: in the only passage in Isocrates where *παρρησία* appears in connection with the gods, it is given the unfavourable meaning of "blasphemy".

Yet the word also had a history of its own in the Christian church. Not only was it used of the bold testimony of the martyrs, but also

* First appeared as "De Semitische achtergrond van ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑ in het Nieuwe Testament", Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 25, No 11, p. 585-601 (1962).

¹ E. Peterson, *Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte von ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑ* in: *Reinhold Seeberg-Festschrift*, Leipzig 1929, p. 283-297; H. Schlier follows in his tracks, but with more evidence s.v. *παρρησία* in G. Kittel-G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1954, vol. V, p. 869 ff.

of the confidence with which the Christian spoke intimately, in prayer, to the Almighty. Here the material is far more plentiful than Peterson suggests. Particularly in the spirituality of the Eastern Church, amongst both Greeks and Syrians, who adopted *parrhèsia* as a loan-word, it plays an important role which has not yet been sufficiently explored. It is noteworthy that it should not have been borrowed in Christian Latin, where it is usually translated by *fiducia* or *audacia* and kindred terms.² We should investigate, then, the extent to which this different usage marks and reflects another spiritual mentality. As an illustration of a more recent development we have only to think of the controversy between Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians concerning the "assurance of faith", and of the curious use of the word "confidence" in ecclesiastical jargon in certain circles in this country—we say, for example, that someone has no "confidence" to pray, or preaches with "confidence".

It is outside the scope of this afternoon's paper to go more closely into this development, partly determined by the New Testament and especially by the use of *παρρησία* in Heb. and 1 Jn. May these brief indications, pointing to much uncharted territory, serve to show that the word is not an arbitrary, insignificant part of the Christian vocabulary, but the bearer of a rich spiritual experience.

It is a remarkable fact that while there is a large measure of continuity in the language of the Old and New Testament, this is lacking in the case of *παρρησία* and the verb derived from it. Although we must be particularly careful with statistical data, such a great discrepancy in usage can be considered significant. A glance at the concordance is sufficient to demonstrate it: the word is used in a few passages in the Septuagint and a relatively large number of times in the New Testament. In the Old Testament it appears almost exclusively, and even then sporadically, in the Wisdom Literature; in the New once in Mark, nine times in John, twelve in Acts, ten in Paul, four in Hebrews and four in 1 John. Since it is not an essential word in Old Testament religion we cannot speak—at least in this respect—of the Semitic background of a term which plays such an important part in New Testament vocabulary.

Judging from the data provided by Peterson and Schlier, too,

² See H. Jaeger, *Παρρησία et fiducia* in: K. Aland-F. L. Cross (eds.) *Studia Patristica*, Berlin 1959, p. 225 ff.

this *παρησία* is so typically connected with the Greek language and Greek culture that there seems to be no question of a background in the Semitic world. Peterson pointed out that it was adopted as a loan-word in Syriac and Jewish Aramaic,³ but Schlier modified this verdict by correctly observing that it does not appear very frequently in Aramaic.⁴ Yet, if we keep Syriac literature in mind, we must say that Peterson was right. We encounter it in a transcribed form on several occasions since the Peshitta, especially amongst mystical writers.⁵ To such a degree had it been assimilated that the question arises of whether it had been adopted because nothing similar could be found in Syriac to express what it expresses. This is not an easy question to answer, since the adoption of words from one language by another is not usually a process that takes place in a single manner, hence we should form a clear idea of the context of this particular adoption. In this case, if we look closer, we will see that *parrhèsia* in Syriac was not merely assimilated as a "technical term", and the matter becomes still more complicated when we discover that there was a perfectly good Syriac equivalent which had not been superseded in any way, but which survived alongside the transcription of *parrhèsia*.⁶

This fact escaped Peterson's attention and he consequently overlooked an important element in the semasiological development of *parrhèsia* in Christian usage. Since the studies of neither Schlier nor Jaeger or others mention this aspect of the problem it has seemed to me to be worth investigating more closely; moreover, the investigation I propose to pursue will bring a number of other interesting matters into view. The very field of transition from one cultural circle to another, which we find in the New Testament, provides us with an interesting starting point. Hence the title of this paper seems justified.

I shall start with the curious text of St Paul—2 Cor. iii 12. In justifying his dealings with the community in this Greek port the apostle shows that he does not need any written recommendation: the work he has performed in Corinth speaks for itself. He is not

³ Peterson, *op. cit.*, p. 297.

⁴ Schlier, *op. cit.*, p. 877.

⁵ See, for example, the references in A. J. Wensinck, *Mystic Treatises by Isaac of Nineveh, Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, deel XXIII, n° 1, Amsterdam 1923, Index, s.v. *Freedom of speech*.

⁶ Sometimes in the most literal sense of the word. See below, p. 296 f.

boasting about his own capacities, however, but says he believes that God has made him competent to do what he has done. He is a servant of the "new covenant" promised by the Old Testament prophets, of the definitive new relationship between God and man (iii 1-6). In three antitheses St Paul shows that the "covenant" introduced by Moses was indeed filled with divine glory according to the account in Exodus, but that the glory of the New Covenant exceeds it by far since its gifts are so much more glorious and lasting (iii 7-11). Having started with this general survey of his work St Paul returns to his dealings with the Corinthians: he has preached the gospel in all honesty, without any desire for profit, cf. ii 17. He then says: "Since we have such a hope, we are very bold, not like Moses, who put a veil over his face" (ἔχοντες οὖν τοιαύτην ἐλπίδα πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ χρώμεθα καὶ οὐ καθάπερ Μωϋσῆς ἐτίθει κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ).

In itself this combination of παρρησίᾳ χρᾶσθαι is perfectly good Greek and is also to be found in Plutarch.⁷ What surprises, however, is the manner in which the acts of Moses are treated. According to the story in Ex. xxxiv Moses covered his face with a veil when he spoke again to the people of Israel after having been with God on the mountain. This is no adventitious image for St Paul: it is of such importance to him that he devotes to it an entire pericope in which the veiling and unveiling occupy a central place (iii 13-18). Furthermore, at the beginning of chap. iv he mentions all sorts of themes from the preceding chapter, and the veiling has a function (iv 3) in describing the open honesty of his apostolic ministry.

The question, then, is: how did St Paul come so suddenly to give this exposition which evidently was of such great significance to him? Nothing seems to lead up to it. In the commentaries we usually read simply that Paul is betraying his earlier education in this particular pericope, reminiscent of a Rabbinic exposition of a Biblical text, a so-called Midrash. The words are seen as an insertion which interrupts the cohesion unnecessarily. Elsewhere I have commented on the passage in greater detail and have tried to show that it is essential to the structure of the closely-reasoned

⁷ Plutarch, *Vita Themist.* XXIX φθόνον ἔσχε παρὰ τοῖς δυνατοῖς, ὥς καὶ κατ' ἐκείνων παρρησίᾳ χρήσασθαι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποτετολμηκώς.—*Vita Coriolani* XVIII ἐπαχθεῖ παρρησίᾳ χρῆσθαι.—*Vita Lysandri* XXII; *Agesilai* XXVII; Dio Cassius 62, 13 οὕτω γὰρ πῶς ἑρρωμένως αὐτῇ (i.e. τῇ παρρησίᾳ) ἔχρητο ὥστε...? Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII 9, 5; Philostratus, *Vita Apoll. Tyan.* V 43.

argument.⁸ Here I only wish to point out that a confusion developed in the exegesis because nobody saw where the association of ideas between *παρρησία* and the episode in the history of the Covenant lay. Usually an ellipse is accepted in vs. 12 and the translation given as: "we are very bold, not like Moses *who* . . ." (R.S.V. and Dutch Bible Soc.) or "we are very bold and *do not veil our faces* as Moses put a veil over his face" (so, for instance, Lietzmann's commentary, and Schlier). But no argument is provided in favour of these insertions. Should we resort to such radical measures? Admittedly no link between "boldness" and "unveiling the face" can be explained from the Greek use of *παρρησία*.

Yet I believe that there is another way of surmounting this difficulty without forcing matters. I once pointed out that various associations of ideas which might astonish us at first sight can be explained by Paul's Semitic thought patterns.⁹ In my view it is here that we must seek the solution to our problem.

If we look at the Syriac translation of 2 Cor. iii 12 we are some way, though not all the way, along the right track. The Peshitta translates the verse as: "we behave ourselves *בגלוי עין*" ¹⁰ = literally "with uncovered eye", a standard expression for "openly".¹¹ This rendering of *παρρησία* can also be found, for example, in Mk viii 32, Jn xviii 20, throughout Acts, Eph. vi 19, Heb. iv 16. But although it is interesting to find the verb "uncover" here, it does not get us much further.

From the investigation of other passages where *παρρησία* appears it emerges that the above translation is not the only one in the Peshitta. In addition to the transcription *פרהסיא* (e.g. 2 Cor. vii 4; Eph. iii 12; 1 Thess. ii 2; Philem. 8; 1 Jn. v 14) we also find the expression *בגלויית אפא* = "uncovering the face". This rendering can be found in Phil. i 20; 1 Tim. iii 13; Heb. iii 6; x 19, 35; 1 Jn ii 28; iii 21 and iv 17. Why the Syriac translation does not show inner

⁸ W. C. van Unnik, "With unveiled Face", an Exegesis of 2 Corinthians iii 12-18 in: *Sparsa Collecta* I, p. 194-210.

⁹ W. C. van Unnik, *Aramaisms in Paul* in *Sparsa Collecta*, I, p. 129-143; *Reisepläne und Amen-sagen, Zusammenhang und Gedankenfolge in 2 Korinther* i 15-24, *ibid.*, p. 144-159.

¹⁰ Since the Syriac script is not so familiar to most readers as the Hebrew one, I have transcribed Syriac expressions in Hebrew.

¹¹ See J. Payne Smith, *A compendious Syriac Dictionary*, Oxford 1903, p. 69 and 411. We also find the word order reversed, *עין בגלויא*, but the meaning is the same.

concordance is a mystery. To what extent the translations of the "Corpus Paulinum" are influenced by earlier renderings where such differences are concerned is something we have been unable to establish hitherto for lack of evidence.

Our expression cannot, then, be regarded as belonging to the language of Canaan, but it was current in Syriac. Of various texts which could be cited¹² for the use of "with uncovered face" in the sense of "confident" I shall choose certain examples taken from the liturgy. Thus, in the Nestorian baptismal liturgy,¹³ prayers are said for the spiritual leaders: "may they be worthy to say 'with uncovered face' (in God's judgement): see, here are we and the children Thou hast given to us". When the priest gives the Cross and the Gospel to the deacons he says: "May Christ Our Lord make you worthy to meet Him (lit. to receive His face) 'with uncovered face' ".¹⁴ Interesting, too, is the introduction to the Lord's Prayer: "Make us worthy, O our Lord and God, that we may stand before You without blemish, with a pure heart and 'with uncovered face' and with *parrhèsia*, which You in Your mercy have given to us".¹⁵ What is striking is the use of both words next to each other: they are synonyms, and, in liturgical prayers, a doubling of the words usually means a strengthening of the prayer. In other liturgies we often find this same mention of confidence or boldness as an introduction to the Lord's Prayer, cf. the Roman Catholic Mass: "*audemus dicere: Pater Noster*".¹⁶ In the liturgies of St James and

¹² E.g. Aphraat, *Demonstr.* XIV 16 **כְּרִמָּה דְּנִתְבְּעוֹן נַעֲמִלוֹן אִנְיָרָא נַעֲמִלוֹן כְּד גְּלִין אִפְיָהוֹן** (tr. Parisot: operarii mercede conducti in vinea laborent, ut amplius possint confidenter requirere); *Dem.* XXII 18 **כְּד גְּלִין אִפְיָהוֹן נִסְבִּין אִנְרָא** (tr. Parisot: stipendium suum cum fiducia percipiunt); *Liber Graduum*, ed. Kmosko, col. 269 **כְּד גְּלִין אִפְיָן** (aperto fronte); Col. 320 **וְהוֹיִן גְּלִין אִפְוָהִי** (aperto cum fronte); idem col. 440. All these passages in the *Liber Graduum* refer to appearing in the presence of God.

¹³ *Liturgia sanctorum Apostolorum Adaei et Maris cui accedunt duae aliae in quibusdam festis et feriis dicendae: necnon Ordo Baptismi*, Urmiae 1890, p. 56 (in: G. Diettrich, *Die nestorianische Taufliturgie*, Giessen 1903, p. 21).

¹⁴ Thus in Codex Sachau 38 Berol. fol. 80a (this text is not to be found in the above-mentioned edition of the Eucharist liturgy).

¹⁵ *Liturgia* p. כה = F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896, vol. I, p. 295; other passages in Brightman, *loc. cit.*, p. 272, 273, 283, 303. Cf. also A. J. Maclean, *East Syrian Daily Offices*, London 1893, p. 20-21: "that He will make us worthy of the excellent glory of the kingdom, and of the joy with his holy angels, and of confidence (lit. openness of face) before Him".

¹⁶ See also Peterson, *op. cit.*, p. 296, who rightly pointed to the fact that *parrhèsia* is necessary here because man addresses God as "Father".

St Mark, from Syria and Egypt respectively, we read: μετὰ παρρησίας, ἀκατακρίτως, ἐν καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ . . . ἀνεπαισχύντῳ προσώπῳ, while certain manuscripts of the liturgy of St James give the text: "with uncovered face without shame".¹⁷ This Greek version raises the question of whether any light is shed on the meaning of the expression "with uncovered face".¹⁸ I shall return to that later.

Another remarkable case of translation must be mentioned at this point. In the *Acta Thomae* c. xiii we read that after the bridal night the bride sits unveiled. The mother says: "Why do you sit so, my child, and are not ashamed, but do as if you had already lived long with a bridegroom? And the father said: Because of great love for your husband you have not even veiled yourself?". In the Syriac text we read here: "and the face of the bride was uncovered" (וּגְלִין אַפִּיהָ); in the Greek tradition there are two readings which cannot be regarded as variants but only as different translations—τὴν ὄψιν ἀσκεπάστον and ἐν πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ.¹⁹ In the first case the Syriac expression is given literally; in the second *ad sensum*. What we see clearly is that the Syriac "uncovering the face" and the Greek παρρησία are to be considered equivalent.

From this somewhat arbitrary collection of texts—deliberately chosen from different periods—it appears that the expression "uncovering the face" remained constantly in use in Syriac and was conceived as synonymous with *parrhèsia*. Why we sometimes come across one word (in transcription) and sometimes the other is not clear. This metaphorical term simply means what the dictionaries say—confidence, boldness—and was always used in a favourable sense. In the texts I am familiar with it is hardly ever used literally. But the text I quoted from the *Acta Thomae* is an interesting example of the fact that the literal meaning was sometimes still felt to be a living reality. And this brings us back to our starting point, 2 Cor. iii 12.

If we replace παρρησία by its Syriac equivalent in the text of

¹⁷ A. Rücker, *Die syrische Jakobosanaphora nach der Rezension des Ja'qôb(h) von Edessa*, Münster in Westf. 1923, p. 48. Cf. Severus of Antioch 115 IV (Patr. Or. VI p. 155): "But the holy church, clearly perceiving and seeing with uncovered face (בְּפָרְצוּפָא גְלִיָּא) the glory of the life to come".

¹⁸ That this term does not appear exclusively in the relationship with God is demonstrated by, amongst others, Elias, *Leven van Johannes van Tella*, ed. H. G. Kleyn, Leyden 1882, p. 8: "and with which uncovering of the face he returned from the capital". This is connected with what we later read (p. 38-39) about his courageous use of the words "we must obey God more than men".

St Paul it becomes immediately evident how the expression "with uncovered face", applied to the service of the New as opposed to the Old Covenant, brings out the contrast with what Moses did according to Ex. xxxiv. I believe that we find proof enough of this in what Paul himself says at the end of the pericope (vs. 18), which should be read in its entirety: "and we all *with unveiled face*" (Gr. ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ = Peshitta **בְּפָנֵינוּ גְּלִיתָא**). Herewith everything falls into place. The etymological and the idiomatic meanings of the term mingle, and at the same time the link with the episode of Moses' veiling lays a strong accent on the etymology. This, in my opinion, provides us with an elegant solution to this "crux interpretum". At the same time it is a conclusive proof of the fact that the apostle Paul was bilingual, for while πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ χρώμεθα is good Greek (see p. 293), this παρρησία undeniably contains the Semitic notion of "unveiling the face".²⁰

But the objection might be raised that the linguistic evidence is taken exclusively from Syriac, the language of Edessa, which spread further and further east and which is known to us almost solely from Christian writings composed after 200. The validity of this observation cannot be denied. In the first place, however, it does not permit us to conclude that **גְּלִיתָא** is a typically Christian term. In the second place, we must make the best of what we have: for the time being there is no other source at our disposal. The language spoken in Syria by the natives in St Paul's day is not known to us from contemporary writings.

If we start with a text by St Paul we should obviously ask ourselves whether the term in question can also be found in Jewish sources. This is indeed the case, but, curiously enough, only in an *unfavourable* sense, a characteristic difference from the use which we have noted in Syriac.

In the Rabbinic writings we very frequently encounter a well-established formula describing an apostate Jew.²¹ Although all

¹⁹ The Syriac text in: W. Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, London 1871, p. **קצב**; the Greek text in the edition of M. Bonnet in: R. A. Lipsius-M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, Darmstadt 1959 (reprint) II 2, p. 119 (both passages).

²⁰ In this connection since the simultaneous appearance of Semitic and Greek idioms is mentioned, we must remember that St Paul had "collaborators" in the composition of his epistles.

²¹ The best collection of texts is W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*, Leipzig 1905, vol. I, p. 149-151.

sorts of subordinate variations appear in the tradition,²² we constantly find these three clauses: an apostate is a man who has rejected the Yoke (of the commandments), who has broken the Covenant (of the circumcision), and who has un-covered his face before the Law (המגלה פנים בתורה). Nowadays this controversial expression²³ is usually interpreted in the sense of "to be impudent towards the Torah".²⁴ Someone guilty of that will have no part in the future life (Tos. Sanh. xii 9); the Day of Atonement will bring him no relief (T. B. Shebuoth 12b-13a). For such a man is like one who has broken all the commandments, or like an idolator (S. Num. xv 22, § 111). As an example of someone who did "uncover his face before the Torah" the wicked king Manasseh is named, because he made scurrilous comments about the sexual behaviour of the Patriarchs (S. Num. xv 30, § 112). In T. Jer. Sanh. x 27c the expression is explained in two manners: (a) as referring to someone who says that the Torah has not been given by God; (b) as referring to someone who openly infringes the words of the Torah. In the last case it is of interest to notice that for "openly" בפרהסיא = ἐν παρρησίᾳ is used, so that the identity is again confirmed.²⁵ G. Kittel saw the expression as an allusion to St Paul.²⁶ In the light of 2 Cor. iii it is indeed tempting to do so, but I believe that

²² A good treatment of the subject is to be found in K. G. Kuhn, *Sifre zu Numeri übersetzt und erklärt*, Stuttgart 1959, p. 793-810.

²³ In addition to the authors mentioned so far see, for example, A. Büchler, *Das Schneiden des Haares als Strafe für den Ehebruch bei den Semiten* in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* XIX, 1905, p. 132; A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*, London, 1928, p. 97 ff.

²⁴ Other views are reported by Büchler, *loc. cit.*, p. 103, n. 2. There has indeed been an attempt to provide an "allegorical interpretation", but this explanation has not found much support—in my opinion rightly. The sins mentioned point in another direction.

²⁵ In *T. B. Erubin* 69, too, the man who profanes the Sabbath not secretly, but in *parrhèsia* (= openly) is clearly equated with the פנים גילוי = the betrayer—the transgressor פנים בגלוי = with uncovered face. For the use of παρρησία as a loan-word see: S. Krauss, *Lehnwörter*, II, p. 48; Billerbeck (see note 26), vol. II, p. 18, 485 f.; A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes*, Stuttgart 1930, p. 187.

²⁶ G. Kittel, *Paulus im Talmud* in: *Rabbinica*, Leipzig 1920; also P. Billerbeck in his *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1924, vol. II, p. 753 ff.; H. Windisch, *Paulus und das Judentum*, Stuttgart 1935, p. 5 regards this as doubtful.

Kuhn²⁷ was right to reject this view: the term is too general for such an interpretation.²⁸

In addition to this stereotyped usage reference should also be made to a few other places where the expression occurs in a different context, although still in connection with notorious villains. In Mekhilta Ex. xvii 8, as an explanation of the text "then came Amalek", we find the commentary: בגילוי פנים with unveiled face, i.e. openly, in contrast to other cases when he came in secret. The name Goliath is explained in T. B. Sota 42b as "because he stood בגילוי פנים = with unveiled face before the Holy One, be He blessed", for in Israel Goliath jeered at God. From this, then, it appears that the term was constantly used by the Rabbis in an unfavourable sense: it was as much as to say "impiously impudent".

We also encounter on several occasions בריש גלי = with uncovered head, an expression linguistically akin to בגילוי פנים. This is said of the manner in which Israel left Egypt. Where Ex. xiv 8 and Num. xxxiii 3 say that the people went out "defiantly" (litt. "by a raised hand"), the Targum reads "with uncovered head", as does Mekhilta Ex. xiv 8. This is interpreted as "with fearless audacity" (Büchler)²⁹ or "in freedom".³⁰ Here the sense is favourable, just as it is in Targ. Judges v 9 where we read that, even in times of distress, the scribes continued to examine the Torah and to instruct the people בריש גלי = with uncovered head = without fear, or: in freedom. But the combination is also used in an unfavourable sense in Targ. Num. xv 30 and T. B. Shabbath 118b.³¹ The term consequently had two meanings.

I should also refer here to the use of the term in Arabic. The great Goldziher once wrote an essay on the subject³² and commented on the curious fact—which he did not explain in more detail—that the uncovering of the head appears on the one hand usually

²⁷ K. G. Kuhn, *op. cit.*, p. 793.

²⁸ H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie des Judentums*, Tübingen 1949, p. 178, n. 1 saw this as a pseudonym for the Ebonites. In view of the attitude of this Jewish Christian Sect to the Law this seems to me to be impossible.

²⁹ A. Büchler, *Schneiden*, p. 132.

³⁰ Billerbeck, vol. II, p. 723 f.; III, p. 424; so too J. Winter-A. Wünsche, *Mekhilta, ein tannaitischer Midrasch zu Exodus*, Leipzig 1909, p. 88.

³¹ *Targ. Num.* xv 30 אנש דיעבד בריש גלי = someone who does something with uncovered head. T. B. Shabbath 118b: may it benefit me that I do not walk four yards בגילוי ראש = with uncovered head.

³² I. Goldziher, *Die Entblössung des Hauptes* in: *Der Islam* VI, 1916, p. 301-316, esp. p. 314 ff.

as "Ausdruck der Demütigung und Unterwerfung", but on the other also as "sich offen auflehnen (gegen die Regierung)". He compares the latter meaning of the metaphor with the Aramaic expression I mentioned earlier. Since I am not an Arabist I cannot go into the question of which use is older or solve the problem of whether these entirely different meanings reflect shifts in the cultural pattern. On the basis of the material I have provided, however, I feel entitled to conclude that there existed in the Semitic languages (Aramaic) a metaphor—"to uncover the face (head)"—which had the meaning of "openly". In the course of linguistic development this tended to evolve in an unfavourable sense amongst the Rabbis and in a favourable sense amongst the Syrians.

Before we investigate the meaning of this metaphor any further another case should be discussed. In a reference to the lost work of Hegesippus (c. A.D. 170) the church historian Eusebius writes that the heretics still lay low in the apostles' lifetime but afterwards tried to spread their false doctrine "with uncovered head" (γυμνῇ κεφαλῇ).³³ Now, it is impossible to tell how far Eusebius was using a formula of his own or whether he was simply repeating the words of his predecessor. In the latter case the matter could be of interest, since Hegesippus came from Palestine; but it is far more likely that the choice of words was Eusebius' own, for we come across this expression in Greek elsewhere. Thus Eusebius himself writes that the pagans had deified their feelings and desires γυμνῇ καὶ ἀκαλύπτῳ κεφαλῇ.³⁴ Origen tells of somebody who writes γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ that the Creator is inclined to evil.³⁵ The editor of Origen's *De Principiis*, Koetschau, regards this phrase as a quotation and refers to the famous words of Socrates who wants to sing a song of praise to Eros γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ, and not like Stesichorus who had been blinded because of his diatribe against Helen but retrieved his eyesight, "covered with infamy",³⁶ by composing a song of praise. The contrast with infamy and shame is also to be found in the Latin

³³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* III 32, 8 οἱ καὶ ἄτε μηδενὸς ἔτι τῶν ἀποστόλων λειπομένου γυμνῇ λοιπὸν ἤδη τῇ κεφαλῇ τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύγματι τὴν ψευδῶν-μον γνώσιν ἀντικηρύττειν ἐπεχείρουν (this refers back to the ἐν ἀδύλῳ που σκότειν in par. 7).

³⁴ Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* VII 2, 2.

³⁵ Origen, *De Principiis* III 1, 9.

³⁶ Plato, *Phaedrus* 243 b πρὶν γάρ τι παθεῖν διὰ τὴν τοῦ Ἔρωτος κατηγορίαν πειράσσομαι αὐτῷ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν παλινωδίαν γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ τότε ὑπ' αἰσχύνῃς ἐγκεκαλυμμένος.

"aperto capite".³⁷ Seneca writes against Epicurus: "indulget illis (vitiis) non timide nec obscure, luxuriatur et jam nude, aperto capite".³⁸ And when Petronius lets a freedman declare proudly that he is not dependent on anyone, the freedman says: "homo inter homines sum, capite aperto ambulo".³⁹ This is clearly a metaphorical expression since the Romans, like the Greeks, usually went bare-headed⁴⁰—and this is certainly the case with Plato where, next to blindness, the "uncovered head", in the sense of "without hat or helmet" (as γυμνός is also used), would not present an anti-thesis. To trace the origin of this expression would carry us too far afield, but it is important to establish that an expression entirely equivalent to the Aramaic בריש גלי⁴¹ was also current in Greek and Roman usage.

What is the meaning of this "unveiling of the face"? How is the metaphor understood? We have just seen that there is a frequent contrast with infamy and shame: whoever goes "with unveiled face" is not ashamed, or is shameless, two nuances, one favourable, the other unfavourable, both contained in the same term.

In the Eastern world of the N.T. time there was a widespread tendency to go about bare-headed, although it was not a fixed custom.⁴² That a certain symbolic value was attached to this is evident in a question to R. Joshua (Gen. Rabbah 17): "Why does a man go bare-headed while a woman goes out with her head covered?". The answer is: "Because she is as someone who has done evil and is ashamed before people".⁴³ It is therefore not enough to refer to later Oriental customs, as Payne Smith did: "apud Orientales enim facies detegitur solum apud familiares",⁴⁴ for these

³⁷ A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig 1890, p. 75. He cites, amongst other authors, Georgius Cypr. I 81: γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀναισχύντως χωρούντων πρὸς πᾶν τὸ τυχόν.

³⁸ Seneca, *De vita beata* XIII 2.

³⁹ Petronius, *Cena Trimalchionis* LVII, 5.

⁴⁰ H. Blümner, *Die römischen Privataltertümer*, München 1911, p. 228.

⁴¹ In *Act. Thomae* 56 in the description of the hell where women are seen hanging by their hair: αἱ μὲν δ' ὅλως αἰδούμεναι καὶ γυμνοκέφαλοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ περιάγουσι (the Syriac text is lacking here).

⁴² See Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 423 ff. and the extensive treatment by S. Krauss, *The Jewish Rite of Covering the Head* in: *Hebrew Union College Annual* XIX, 1945-46, p. 121-168.

⁴³ According to *Pirke de R. Eliezer* 14 Eve received nine forms of curse and death after the Fall; one of them is: "her head is covered, like a woman in mourning".

⁴⁴ R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, Oxford 1879, vol. I, col. 721.

customs seem to have undergone some alteration in the course of the centuries.

In order to determine the meaning a little more clearly we would do better to start with the opposite concept: the covering of the head or the face.⁴⁵ Here we have a great deal of evidence from cultural and religious history (inasmuch as it is possible to distinguish between the two in Antiquity). It cannot all be treated here, nor is it necessary that it should be. For our own purposes we can limit ourselves to a few references to the phenomenon and its significance in the Bible and the world of the New Testament: what matters is not the *origin* of the concept, but *how it was viewed* by men at the time of the N.T.⁴⁶

In 1 Enoch xiii 9 we read that the fallen angels sat down πενθοῦντες . . . περικεκαλυμμένοι τὴν ὄψιν. This is clearly a mourning custom. As such we are familiar with the covering of the face in the O.T. too, as, for example, in 2 Sam. xv 30 and Esther vi 12.⁴⁷ But it can also mean shame, as in Jer. xiv 3 f. "They are ashamed and confounded and cover their heads".⁴⁸ It is therefore more than a means of not being recognized and performing one's practices in the dark—the reason for which the adulterer (Job xxiv 15) and the whore (Gen. xxxviii 15) covered themselves.

But covering can also be a sign of reverence, as when Moses and Elijah cover their face in the presence of God (Ex. iii 6 and 1 Kings xix 13) as do the Seraphim (Is. vi 2). This is apparent from the way in which the Rabbis passed on their esoteric doctrine⁴⁹: when discussing the vision of the throne in Ez. 1 Rabbi Johanan b. Zaccai enveloped himself in his cloak because the divine Majesty

⁴⁵ One can argue about whether "covering of the head" is the same as "covering the face". I believe that when the "covering of the head" is mentioned as such, and does not simply refer to a hat, it also includes the face.

⁴⁶ In A. Jeremias, *Der Schleier von Sumer bis heute*, Leipzig 1931, this is not taken into account. Data from a variety of cultural circles are muddled up in an astonishing way and, despite the expectations raised by the title which evokes the remark "excusez du peu", much is left undiscussed.

⁴⁷ Esther vi 12: after the homage of Mordecai "Haman hurried to his house, mourning and with his head covered"; Josephus, *Ant.* XI 6, 10, describes this with the words: ὑπ' αἰσχύνης πρὸς αὐτὸν παραγίγνεται. Phaedra covers her head, one of the customs of mourning, Ovid, *Fasti* II 813 ff.

⁴⁸ Cf. also 2 Sam. xix 4-5: when David has covered his face in mourning for Abshalom Joab says to him: "You have today covered with shame the faces of all your servants" by going into mourning rather than celebrating the victory over the rebel.

⁴⁹ Cf. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*², Berlin 1958, vol. II B, p. 106.

was present (T.B. Hagigah 14b). This too is why the Rabbis later all covered their heads when they were teaching, although Mishnah Sotah ix 15 explains the habit by saying that "since the Temple has been destroyed the learned and the notables are ashamed and cover their heads". The element of reverence is equally expressed in the Gnostic myth according to which Akhamoth veiled herself in deference.⁵⁰

There are a few places where we read that those who are about to die cover their face. Thus in Jub. xxiii 1 Abraham "blessed the God of Gods, and he covered his face and stretched out his feet, and slept the sleep of eternity".⁵¹ But the description in Test. Naphtali ix 2 is also striking: καὶ φαγὼν καὶ πιών ἐν ἰλαρότητι ψυχῆς συνεκάλυψε τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπέθανε. In this same context we should perhaps mention Esther vii 8: "As the words left the mouth of the king, they covered Haman's face". The commentators usually regard this covering as a sign of condemnation to death⁵², but the text is also interesting because neither the Septuagint nor Josephus offer a literal translation, but give a version which proves that in their day the term was already regarded as a metaphor.⁵³

From this we can perceive the symbolic value which the covering of the head possessed.⁵⁴ The antithesis, therefore, the "uncovering of the face or head", implies not only the absence of shame, but the cessation of mourning. With reference to God it could also mean

⁵⁰ In Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I 4, 5; Tertullian, *Adv. Valentinianos* 16: "velamentum sibi obdixit ex officio primo venerationis et verecundiae". This divine reverence is also evident in the behaviour of Vitellius' father before Caligula in Suetonius, *Vitellius* II 4, 5: "Idem miri in adulando ingenii primus C. Caesarem *adorare ut deum* instituit, cum reversus ex Syria non aliter adire ausus esset quam *capite velato* circumvertensque se, deinde procumbens". It is worth noting that he did so after returning from Syria.

⁵¹ Cf. the well-known passage in Plato, *Phaedo* 118a, about the death of Socrates: in order to utter a last word he uncovered his face: ἐνεκάλυπτο γάρ. See also Xenophon, *Cyrop.* VIII 7, 26.

⁵² Referring to passages in Greek and Roman writers; see, for example, J. Schildenberger, *Das Buch Esther*, Bonn 1941, p. 105. See also the scornful remark of Aelius Aristides, *Orat.* XXVIII, about the orators who, in order to catch people's attention, cover their heads and thereby show what they deserve—death.

⁵³ LXX: διετράπη τῷ προσώπῳ; Josephus, *Ant.* XI 6, 11: καταπλαγέντος καὶ μηδὲν ἔτι φθέγγασθαι δυνήθέντος.

⁵⁴ Is. xxix 10: "For the Lord has poured out upon you a spirit of deep sleep, and has closed your eyes, the prophets, and covered your heads, the seers" indicates the judgement of God by which prophecy has become powerless. Cf. Num. xxii 31; xxiv 4, 16. For the significance of this verse in connection with 2 Cor. iii 13 see my article mentioned in note 8.

the absence of reverence—and that, as we have seen (p. 298 f.), is how the later Jewish sources regarded it. But this is not the only possibility.

In his description of the posture of the Christians when praying (Apol. xxx 4) Tertullian explains, amongst other things, that they pray “capite nudo, quia non erubescimus”. We have to think here too of that passage of St Paul which is in many respects so difficult—1 Cor. xi 4: πᾶς ἄνθρωπος προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων καταισχύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ---. 7 ἄνθρωπος μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ὀφείλει κατακαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν, εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων.

I also regard as important for the understanding of this concept a text in Is. xxv, where the great feast is described which God will prepare for all peoples. “(7) And he will *destroy* on this mountain the covering that is cast over all peoples, the *veil* that is spread over all nations. (8) He will swallow up death for ever, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from all faces, and the reproach of his people he will take away from all the earth”. There will then be rejoicing over the salvation given by the Lord.

The text of vs. 7 is difficult in several of its constituent parts, but in the main it can be explained.⁵⁵ In this context the link between the covering of the face and death, mourning and shame, is obvious. What is important here is the eschatological framework. It is God Himself who will remove the veil at the end of time. As far as mankind is concerned, therefore, it is not a question of shamelessness or lack of reverence, but of true community with God. This prophecy was important to St Paul, as we see from the quotation of vs. 8 in 1 Cor. xv 55 (cf. also Rev. vii 17; xxi 4). For St Paul the metaphor of “unveiling the face” was not, of course, evoked by the passage in Isaiah, since the metaphor in itself also appears outside Christian literature. But in view of the fact that it existed, St Paul may well have seen the words of the prophet as a Scriptural indication in order to elaborate his own views, e.g. with regard to the pagans. Owing to lack of evidence, however, this must remain an hypothesis.

After our fairly extensive treatment of the background of the Semitic equivalent of *παρρησία*, we can conclude that the origin and associations of this concept are entirely different from the ones we encounter in the Greek term. A short time ago an English Old

⁵⁵ Cf. E. S. Mulder, *Die teologie van die Jesaja—Apokalipse Jesaja 24-27*, Groningen-Djakarta, 1954, p. 31-32.

Testament scholar, J. Barr, launched a sharp attack against much work which has been performed in the domain of Old and New Testament philology in the last decades. One of his chief complaints was about what he regards as an excessive tendency to etymologize.⁵⁶ Barr's warning must be taken to heart, but we cannot overlook the fact that the English scholar—at any rate where the New Testament is concerned—paid too little attention to those lacunae in the source material which frequently force us to work with data of very different origins (see, for example, p. 297). He also gave too little heed to the method which the Rabbis often applied in their argumentation, in which the etymology or similarity of the consonants of words contributes to the interpretation.⁵⁷ The passage I have just discussed from 2 Cor. iii is, in my view, an example of the fact that St Paul was perfectly conscious of the etymology of a given word. And that he was not alone in this, but that, in the present case, it happened on more than one occasion, is proved by the passage I cited from the *Acta Thomae* (p. 296).

Whether they mean "open-hearted", "without fear" or "openly", the notions of παρρησία and "uncovering of the face" have so much in common with each other that they could appear as equivalents. They do not, however, coincide completely. We cannot deny that there are many passages in the N.T. where παρρησία has a significance which would have been perfectly comprehensible to a Greek; but we cannot deny either that it also appears in contexts which are different from the Greek ones. The connection with "friendship" is lacking, for example. In addition to this there is the curious fact that in a strongly Hellenizing book like the Acts of the Apostles it only appears in passages concerning the relationship between the apostles and the Jews,⁵⁸ something, I believe, which can only be explained as an application of those same ideas conveyed by St Paul in 2 Cor. iii 12-18 with the metaphor of "unveiling the face".

That the element of "uncover" in the sense of "reveal" is also present in St Paul's use of παρρησία seems clear to me in the parallelism between Eph. vi 20 τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ὑπὲρ οὗ πρεσβεύω ἐν ἀλύσει ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ παρρησιάζωμαι ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι

⁵⁶ J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, Oxford 1961.

⁵⁷ See the summary of the Rabbinic methods of exegesis in J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, Assen 1953, p. 89.

⁵⁸ See my discussion of the N.T. passages in: *The Christians' Freedom of Speech in the New Testament*, Manchester 1962 (T. W. Manson-Memorial Lecture), in this volume p. 269-289.

and Col. iv 4 τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' ὃ καὶ δέδεμαι ἵνα φανερώσω αὐτὸ ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι. The similarity of the formulation is so striking that the equivalence of παρρησιάζωμαι and φανερώσω becomes obvious. This, in its turn, can only be explained if we see πλην in the background. A similar case appears in Jn. vii 4: οὐδεὶς γάρ τι ἐν κρυπτῷ ποιεῖ καὶ ζητεῖ αὐτὸς ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι. εἰ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, φανέρωσον σεαυτὸν τῷ κόσμῳ. This aspect of "revelation" is heavily implied in the N.T. usage of παρρησία. It is not simply "to speak one's mind boldly, openly", but the revelation of the secret that has lain hidden for centuries (cf. Eph. iii 4 ff; Col. i 26).

We may well ask ourselves whether the inhabitants of Corinth understood Paul's association of ideas. To this a threefold answer can be given. In the first place only a part of St Paul's teaching is contained in his epistles. What he expounded in the year and a half of his mission in Corinth (Acts xviii 11) is only partially known to us: we know it in the main but not in detail. In the second place there was a very mixed population in the Greek port. There was a Jewish synagogue, the leader of which became a supporter of St Paul's (Acts xviii 8; 1 Cor. i 14), so that we cannot exclude the possibility that the Corinthians were familiar with typical Rabbinical methods of exegesis. In the third place it appears from the various texts which I have cited that there were a number of striking similarities between the Jewish and "pagan" attitudes towards covering and uncovering the face. The language of certain acts and forms constituted, in many respects, a common fund, and, despite differences in the spoken language, was perfectly comprehensible to the ancients. In these strongly traditional cultures there was a special sensibility to such symbols.

But whether or not St Paul was understood—according to 2 Pet. iii 16 this was by no means easy in antiquity—we must try to understand his objectives, and it seems to me that in this case we must proceed along the lines I have just sketched.

By using the Greek word παρρησία as an allusion to the new situation in which the "revelation of the mystery" (Rom. xvi 25) in Jesus Christ placed man before God and before the proclaimer of the gospel in the world, Christianity gave it a number of interesting overtones. It became an important element in the Christian vocabulary, an element whose full significance has not yet been adequately explored.

DIE RÜCKSICHT AUF DIE REAKTION DER NICHT-CHRISTEN ALS MOTIV IN DER ALTCHRISTLICHEN PARÄNESE*

In der Theorie und Praxis der altchristlichen Ethik findet man an verschiedenen Stellen Aussagen, die darauf hinweisen, daß der Christ in seiner Lebensführung auch mit dem Urteil der Nicht-Christen zu rechnen hat. Der Wille Gottes gilt nicht nur dem Einzelnen, sondern dem Menschen in Zusammenhang mit seinen Mitmenschen. Im Doppelgebot der Liebe ist der „Nächste“, ob er Christ sei oder nicht, miteinbezogen. Das Volk Gottes lebt in der Welt und zwar in den ersten Jahrhunderten als eine kleine Minorität, nicht isoliert. Deshalb löst sein Dasein und Tun eine Reaktion aus, welche sich zuweilen in der scharfen Form der Verfolgungen geäußert hat. Für die Christen erhob sich die Frage, ob und in welcher Hinsicht sie in der Konkretisierung ihres Auftrags auf die Reaktion der Nicht-Christen Rücksicht zu nehmen hatten.

Einen guten Einblick in die Lebensgestaltung der frühchristlichen Gemeinde bekommt man in der stark eschatologisch bestimmten Bußpredigt, die als der II Klemensbrief überliefert ist und wahrscheinlich aus der ersten Hälfte des II. Jh.s stammt.¹ Für den Verfasser ist das Christusbekenntnis nur möglich im Gehorsam: „Womit bekennen wir ihn? Dadurch, daß wir tun, was er sagt, und seinen Geboten nicht ungehorsam sind und nicht nur mit den Lippen ihn ehren, sondern von ganzem Herzen und von ganzem Gemüte“ (iii 4).² In dieser Predigt kommt das Motiv der Beachtung heidnischer Reaktion klar an den Tag. Dabei ist der Text in xiii 1 merkwürdig, ja etwas paradox formuliert: καὶ μὴ γινώμεθα ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι μηδὲ θέλωμεν μόνον ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἔξω ἀνθρώποις ἐπὶ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. Man hätte doch wohl als Gegensatz zum ἀνθρωπάρεσκεν erwartet, daß über das ἀρέσκειν τῷ θεῷ gesprochen wäre, wie z. B. bei Paulus in 1 Thess ii 4 οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες, ἀλλὰ θεῷ oder Ignatius, Rm ii 1 οὐ γὰρ θέλω

* Erschienen in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche, Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*, Töpelmann-Berlin, 1964, S. 221-234.

¹ B. Altaner, *Patrologie*⁵, Freiburg im Br. 1958, S. 82-83.

² Übersetzung von R. Knopf, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel, die zwei Klemensbriefe*, Tübingen 1920.

ὁμᾶς ἀνθρωπαρεσκῆσαι, ἀλλὰ θεῷ ἀρέσαι ὥσπερ καὶ ἀρέσκετε. Fordert eigentlich der zweite Teil nicht auf zu dem, was im Anfang abgewiesen ist? Dabei soll bedacht sein, daß ἀνθρωπάρεστος, das man bisher nur im Bibeltgriechischen hat nachweisen können, immer einen ungünstigen Sinn hat. Foerster umschreibt den Inhalt mit diesen Worten: „einer, der nur mit Menschen und ihrer Macht rechnet“.³ Es drückt also ein Verhalten aus, bei dem nicht Gottes Wort, sondern das Urteil der Menschen letztes Prinzip des Handelns ist und man sich dem Wohlgefallen der Mitmenschen ohne weiteres konformiert. Dabei braucht man nicht nur an Liederlichkeit zu denken; es kann wohl allgemein ein gewisser Konformismus sein. In einer Gesellschaft, wo das ganze Leben von religiösen Riten durchzogen ist und die „Gewohnheit“ solche Bedeutung hatte wie im Altertum, ist jeder, der nicht das mitmacht, was jedermann tut, etwas verdächtig. Der Wunsch, ein ruhiges Leben zu führen, konnte dazu verführen, sich ohne weiteres seiner Umgebung anzuschließen. Das wird hier verboten, denn der Wille Gottes ist für die Christen entscheidend. Das Folgende steht also unter dem unausgesprochenen Vorzeichen: „wir als Christen sollen Gott gefallen“. Was bedeutet das in concreto, ohne eine fromme Phrase zu werden? Das hat der Verfasser in dem folgenden Gegensatz ausgedrückt: als Christen sollen sie nicht nur ihren Mitchristen gefällig sein ohne dabei mit der übrigen Welt zu rechnen, sondern auch „den Menschen da draußen“, d. h. wie xiii 3-4 angibt, den „Heiden“. Das Gebot Gottes gilt nicht nur für die christliche Gruppe in ihrer Isolierung als die Auserwählten, während die Übrigen als eine verdamnte Masse nicht in Rechnung gezogen werden. Das Gebot Gottes soll die Direktive ihres Lebens überhaupt sein, allen Menschen ohne Ausnahme gegenüber. Nicht ohne Bedeutung, als etwas Überflüssiges, wird ἐπὶ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ hier zugefügt, denn hier wird das Gebiet genannt, worin sich das „den Draußenstehenden Gefällig-sein“ auswirken soll. Im Altertum findet man oft bei Christen und Nicht-Christen das Ideal für ein gutes Leben im Begriffspaar εὐσέβεια καὶ δικαιοσύνη ausgedrückt,⁴ wobei das erste Wort das richtige Verhalten Gott oder den Göttern gegenüber, das letzte das richtige Verhalten den Menschen gegenüber angibt. Natürlich war es für die Christen unmöglich in der Gottesverehrung

³ W. Foerster, in G. Kittel-G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1933, Bd. I, S. 456.

⁴ G. Schrenk, in Kittel-Friedrich, Bd. II, S. 184.

den Heiden gefällig zu sein; in der Ethik aber sollen sie den besten Normen entsprechen.

Die Heiden werden und können die Christen beurteilen. Der Maßstab wird dabei jedoch nicht gefunden in den Idealen der heidnischen Ethik, sondern in der christlichen Predigt: „denn wenn die Heiden aus unserm Munde die Worte Gottes hören, bewundern sie sie als herrlich und groß. Danach aber, wenn sie herausfinden, daß unsere Werke nicht der Worte würdig sind, die wir reden, wenden sie sich von da ab zur Lästerung, indem sie sagen, es sei Fabel und Betrug“, was an einem Worte über die Feindesliebe ⁵ exemplifiziert wird. Die Predigt des Evangeliums ist also nicht Geheimlehre — das ist wichtig in Zusammenhang mit der Bedeutung von οἱ ἕξω ἄνθρωποι ⁶ — sondern allgemein zugänglich. Wort und Tat ⁷ sollen bei den Christen im Einklang stehen.

Man kann jedoch nicht mit Knopf ⁸ sagen, daß hier das Motiv die „Gemeindeehre“ ist, denn der Verfasser sagt, daß die Christen sich so bei den Heiden angenehm machen sollen, „damit um unsertwillen der Name nicht gelästert werde“. Wie auch anderswo wird das Wort „Name“ hier absolut gebracht als Bezeichnung für Gott oder Christus.⁹ Durch ein doppeltes Schriftzitat (s. u.) und die Wiederholung des Begriffes in den nachfolgenden Sätzen wird diese gefährliche Möglichkeit, zur Gotteslästerung Anlaß zu geben, unterstrichen. Wenn die Christusbekenner Gottes Gebote nicht halten, wird das ihnen nicht angerechnet, werden sie nicht als schlechte Menschen verurteilt, sondern wird das Gott zur Last gelegt: Er findet bei seinen Anhängern keinen Gehorsam; deshalb wird Gottes Wort als Fabel angesehen und nicht in ihrem Ernst

⁵ In diesem Zusammenhang wird ein Wort, das an Lk vi 32 f. erinnert, aber damit nicht identisch ist, zitiert, vgl. Knopf, z. St.

⁶ Aus Mk iv 13 könnte man schließen, das οἱ ἕξω eine exklusive Bedeutung hatte, gegenüber den Eingeweihten. Der Gebrauch in der übrigen altchristlichen Literatur, s. W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*⁵, Berlin 1958, Sp. 552 f. bezeugt deutlich, daß es kein terminus technicus gewesen ist, sondern einfach das Faktum feststellte, daß es neben den Christen Leute gab, die nicht dazugehörten. Der Terminus stammt wohl aus der politischen Sphäre, bedeutet also etwa „Ausländer“, cf. neben Josephus, *Ant.* XV 9, 2 § 314 und 316, wo ἕξω und ἕξωθεν synonym sind, auch Dionysius Hal., *Ant. Rom.* VII 8, 2. Vgl. auch J. Behm, in Kittel-Friedrich, Bd. II S. 572 f.

⁷ Einige Stellen hat soeben O. Andrén, *Rättfärdighet och Frid*, Uppsala 1960, S. 68 f. zusammengebracht; ohne Vollständigkeit, denn die Verbindung findet sich in der antiken Literatur unzählige Male.

⁸ R. Knopf, z. St.

⁹ R. Knopf, z. St. und H. Bietenhard, in Kittel-Friedrich, Bd. V, S. 270 ff.

angenommen. In dem Betragen der Christen steht nicht die Ehre der Gemeinde, sondern die Ehre Gottes auf dem Spiel.

Das ἀρέσαι τοῖς ἔξω ἀνθρώποις wird hier also nicht positiv verwertet, d. h. um die Heiden für das Christentum zu gewinnen. Es ist eigentlich etwas negativ gefüllt, nämlich keinen Anlaß zur Lästerung geben, welche entsteht in der Spannung zwischen dem schönen und anziehenden Worte der Predigt und dem Benehmen der Christen.

Obwohl wir sehen werden, daß der Verfasser sich auf Paulus hätte berufen können, tut er das merkwürdigerweise nicht. Dagegen argumentiert er mit einigen Worten, die wie Schriftzitate aussehen: λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος· Διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ πάλιν· Οὐαὶ δι' ὃν βλασφημεῖται τὸ ὄνομά μου. ἐν τίνι βλασφημεῖται; ἐν τῷ μὴ ποιεῖν ὑμᾶς ἃ βούλομαι.¹⁰ Diese Kombination ist auffallend; der erste Text stellt nur fest, daß des Herrn Name gelästert wird; der zweite knüpft als Wehruf dabei an und macht eigentlich erst das Ganze brauchbar für die Argumentation. Dabei soll bemerkt sein, daß im ersten Zitat einige Worte fehlen, die eigentlich an sich unentbehrlich sind und die zweite „Anführung“ bisher nicht nachgewiesen ist.¹¹ Eine nähere Betrachtung der Texte lohnt sich:

a) Διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Das erinnert an das Herrenwort in Jes. lii 5 LXX δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Bei Paulus wird das in einem antijüdischen Abschnitt, wo er auch den Gegensatz zwischen Lehre und Lebensführung betont, folgendermaßen angeführt: τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καθὼς γέγραπται.¹² Wie bekannt ist dieser Text abweichend vom hebräischen: „und beständig, allezeit wird mein Name gelästert“,¹³ nämlich von den Heiden, die Israel exiliert haben und sich mächtiger als Gott dünken. Thackeray und Schlatter glaubten, daß die

¹⁰ Mit H. von Schubert in E. Hennecke, *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen 1904 und R. Knopf in ihren Kommentaren soll man wohl annehmen, daß das Zitat bis βούλομαι einschließlich geht; anders ist der Dialog unbegreiflich.

¹¹ Die Textüberlieferung ist unsicher: S πάλιν· Οὐαὶ δι' ὃν — H διό; alle Textausgaben und Kommentare folgen S.

¹² Paulus hat sich das Zitat für seinen Zusammenhang zurechtgemacht; deshalb kommt die Angabe, daß es sich um ein Zitat handelt, mit καθὼς γέγραπται hinterher.

¹³ So in MT. (DSIs a hat eine kleine, für uns nicht wichtige Abweichung; DSIs b fehlt hier), Syr. Vulg. Das Targum ist abweichend, geht aber nicht in die Richtung von LXX.

Septuaginta hier nach Paulus korrigiert sei;¹⁴ dagegen ist Seeligmann der Ansicht, daß es die ursprüngliche Lesung der LXX ist, welche von Hes. xxxvi 20 ff. beeinflußt wurde (dafür gibt er auch andere Beispiele) und den Jesajatext „aktualisierte“ durch die Erfahrungen der Diaspora.¹⁵ In anderen altchristlichen Texten, wo dieses Wort angeführt wird, lautet es immer: „um euretwillen wird mein Name unter den Heiden gelästert“.¹⁶ Auch haben diese Kirchenväter das Wort als ein „testimonium adversus Judaeos“, aber nicht wie Paulus in einem ethischen Zusammenhang, sondern entweder als Prophezeiung der jüdischen Propaganda gegen die Christen (Justin, Dial. 17, Tertullian, Adv. Marc. IV 14) oder als Zeichen, daß die Juden von Gott entfremdet und zerstreut sind (Tertullian, Adv. Marc. III 23, Cyprian, Epist. XIII 3). — Überschaute man das Material, dann zeigt sich: 1. daß das Wort in seiner LXX-Form in der antijüdischen Polemik gebraucht wurde, wobei es in verschiedener Weise angewandt wurde; II Klemens tut dies nicht, braucht es vielmehr als Warnung gegen die Christen (cf. auch iii 5 = Jes. xxix 13 und Mt xv 8 p.); 2. daß II Klemens bezeichnenderweise δι' ὑμᾶς nicht hat, obwohl diese Worte doch ganz zu seiner Argumentation passen würden; dagegen als einziger πᾶσιν liest. Diese beiden Abweichungen sind sehr auffallend. Sie schließen m. E. eine Beeinflussung durch Paulus aus, obwohl er mit dem Apostel den ethischen Kontext teilt.¹⁷

¹⁴ H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to contemporary Jewish thought*, London 1900, p. 188; A. Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, Stuttgart 1935, S. 106.

¹⁵ I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, Leiden 1948, p. 74, 113.

¹⁶ Justinus, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 17 οὐ μόνον οὐ μετενοήσατε ἐφ' οἷς ἐπράξατε κακοῖς ἀλλὰ ἄνδρας ἐκλεκτοὺς ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐκλεξάμενοι τότε ἐξεπέμψατε εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, λέγοντας αἴρεσιν ἄθεον χριστιανῶν πεφνηνέναι, καταλέγοντάς τε ταῦτα ἅπερ καθ' ἡμῶν οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες ἡμᾶς πάντες λέγουσιν· ὥστε οὐ μόνον ἑαυτοῖς ἀδικίας αἵτιοι ὑπάρχετε, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἀπλῶς ἀνθρώποις. (2) καὶ δικαίως βοᾷ Ἡσαίας· Δι' ὑμᾶς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Tertullianus, *Adv. Marcionem* III 23 Et ita subtractis charismatum roribus lex et prophetae usque ad Ioannem. Dehinc cum ea perseverantia furoris et nomen domini per ipsos blasphemaretur, sicut scriptum est: Propter vos blasphematur nomen meum in nationibus (ab illis enim coepit infamia), et tempus medium a Tiberio usque ad Vespasianum non paenitentiam intellexissent, facta est terra eorum deserta etc. — *Adv. Marc.* IV 14 16 sicut per Esaiam ad auctores odii Iudaeos: Propter vos blasphematur nomen meum in nationibus. — Cyprianus *Epist.* XIII 3 Non sicut Iudaei a Deo alienati sunt, propter quos nomen Dei blasphematur in gentibus.

¹⁷ Von H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*², Cambridge 1914, p. 411 wird dieser Text nicht behandelt.

b) οὐαὶ δι' ὃν βλασφημεῖται κτλ. Das durch πάλιν angeschlossene ¹⁸ zweite Zitat mit Stichwortverbindung ist keine einfache Verdopplung, sondern für die Erörterung notwendige Fortführung. Die Quelle ist unbekannt, was angesichts der anderen apokryphen Anführungen in dieser Predigt nicht befremdet. Aber von Lightfoot und Knopf ¹⁹ ist darauf hingewiesen worden, daß es auch an anderen Stellen der altchristlichen Literatur vorkommt, nämlich bei Ignatius, Polycarp und Apost. Const. = Disdascalia.

1. Ignatius, Ad Trall. viii 2 μὴ ἀφορμὰς δίδοτε τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἵνα μὴ δι' ὀλίγους ἄφρονας τὸ ἐν θεῷ πληθὺς βλασφημεῖται· οὐαὶ γάρ, δι' οὗ ἐπὶ ματαιότητι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπὶ τινων βλασφημεῖται. — Das ἐπὶ ματαιότητι stammt wohl aus dem Dekalog, Ex. xx 7 — hier ist nur scheinbar die Ehre der Gemeinde gemeint; es gilt dem πληθὺς ἐν θεῷ.

2. Polycarpus, Ad Philipp. x, 3 f. (nur lateinisch erhalten): Cum possitis benefacere, nolite differre, quia eleemosyna de morte liberat. Omnes vobis invicem subiecti estote, conversationem vestram irreprehensibilem habentes in gentibus, ut ex bonis operibus vestris et vos laudem accipiatis et dominus in vobis non blasphemetur. Vae autem per quem nomen domini blasphematur.

3. Didasc. Apost. 3 = Apost. Const. I 10 die Weiber werden gemahnt, nicht mit ihren Männern zu zanken: ἵνα σου ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐὰν ᾗ πιστὸς ἢ ἐθνικός, μὴ διὰ σέ σκανδαλισθεῖς βλασφημῆσθαι θεὸν καὶ σὺ τοῦ οὐαὶ κληρονόμος εὐρεθῇς παρὰ θεῷ. Οὐαὶ γάρ, φησὶν, δι' οὗ τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

4. Apost. Const. III 5, 6 (nicht in dem syrischen Text; Lat. fehlt): über die Predigt durch Witwen, die nur über bestimmte Kapitel der Dogmatik handeln dürfen, damit die Heiden nicht lästern καὶ ἐνοχος ἔσται τῆς προπετείας ἡ πρεσβυτής καὶ τῆς βλασφημίας καὶ τὸ οὐαὶ κληρονομήσει. Οὐαὶ δέ, φησὶν, δι' οὗ τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

All diese οὐαὶ-Sprüche sind miteinander verwandt und werden als Hl. Schrift angeführt (mit Ausnahme von Polycarp, der überhaupt eigene Gedanken und Zitate oft vermischt; deshalb auch „domini“ anstatt „mei“). Lightfoot hat in den letzten Fällen Einfluß

¹⁸ Für πάλιν als Weiterführung von Zitaten vgl. W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, Sp. 1203, s. v. 3.

¹⁹ R. Knopf, z. St.; J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, part ii, *St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp*², London 1889, vol. ii, p. 172.

von Ignatius angenommen; ²⁰ das scheint mir im Hinblick auf den verschiedenen Wortlaut ausgeschlossen, zumal man in der *Didascalia* oft apokryphe Zitate findet.²¹ Auch Ignatius gibt deutlich eine Anführung; deshalb muß das Wort vor ihm bestanden haben und von ihm als autoritativ betrachtet sein. Es ist merkwürdig, daß Justin, *Dial.* 17 diese Form nicht zu kennen scheint, obwohl er im Folgenden verschiedene andere Schriftstellen, die alle mit οὐαί anfangen und deutlich unter diesem Stichwort verbunden sind, nennt.²² Ein Anklang findet sich, jedoch ohne οὐαί, bei Clemens Alex., *Strom.* III 5, 46, 4 in einer Abhandlung gegen die Enkratiten: τοιαῦτα γὰρ διδάσκουσιν οἱ τῆς συζυγίας μερισταί, δι' οὓς καὶ τὸ ὄνομα βλασφημεῖται. All diesen Texten gemeinsam ist, daß sie als Warnung gegen Christen gerichtet sind und mit dem Wandel der Christen in Verbindung stehen. Die Fälle, in denen das Wort angewendet wird, sind jedoch nicht identisch, so daß nicht ein festgeformtes Stück der Paränese vorliegt oder von literarischer Abhängigkeit gesprochen werden muß. Wohl war das Wort so bekannt, daß es, wenn irgendwie das Benehmen der Christen den Heiden anstoßgebend sein konnte, verwendet wurde.

Obwohl Daniélou vor kurzem richtig betont hat, daß man bei den *Testimonia* oft dem Prinzip „der Akkomodation für einen bequemeren katechetischen Gebrauch“ begegnet ²³ und man deshalb geneigt sein möchte, hier eine Abwandlung von Jes. lii 5 zu finden, scheint mir das in diesem Falle nicht wahrscheinlich. Denn es erklärt nicht, woher das οὐαί stammt und woher der Schlußdialog in 2 Klemens (s. o. S. 310, Anm. 11). Es muß eine Art von heiliger Schrift sein.²⁴ Der Dialog erinnert an Mal. i 6 f. (vgl. z. B. ὑμεῖς οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ φαυλίζοντες τὸ ὄνομά μου· καὶ εἶπατε· ἐν τίνι ἐφαυλίσαμεν τὸ ὄνομά σου); es ist eine Art von Selbstrechtfertigung, wie Mt. xxv 44.

²⁰ Lightfoot, *l. c.*: „there is a certain presumption that they derived the quotations from him“ (Ignatius).

²¹ R. H. Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Oxford 1929, p. lxxv ff.

²² Es ist natürlich möglich, daß unter dem Einfluß solch einer Sammlung das Zitat umgebildet wurde. Andererseits darf darauf hingewiesen werden, daß nach P. Katz, *The Recovery of the Original Septuagint in Actes du Ier Congrès des études classiques* 1948, p. 176 f. und P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*², Oxford 1959, p. 229 der ursprüngliche Text des AT bei Justin durch den der späteren lukianischen Rezension ersetzt und so überliefert wurde.

²³ J. Daniélou, *Das Leben, das am Holze hängt, in Kirche und Überlieferung, Festschrift für Joseph Rupert Geiselmann*, Freiburg-Basel-Wien, 1960, S. 23.

²⁴ Vgl. die Bemerkungen von W. Bauer, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien und der Polykarpbrief*, Tübingen 1920, S. 237.

Weherufe finden sich ziemlich viele in 1 Henoch 94 ff., die unserem Spruch formell ähnlich sind. Dabei läßt sich auch im Henochbuch ein Widerhall von Prophetenworten feststellen. Deshalb scheint es am einfachsten anzunehmen, daß das Wort einer prophetisch-apokalyptischen Schrift, in vielen dem Henochbuch gleichartig, entnommen ist. Vielleicht wird eines Tages Qumran auch dieses Rätsel lösen (s. u. S. 320).

Zusammenfassend kann man sagen, daß der II Klemensbrief mit seiner Verwendung dieses Motivs in der Paränese nicht allein steht, sondern ein auch von anderen benutztes Thema gebraucht, wobei die Formulierung und Anwendung verschieden sein kann, aber die Begründung immer die gleiche ist: „damit der Name nicht gelästert werde“; deshalb sollen die Christen in ihrem öffentlichen Auftreten auch auf die Heiden Rücksicht nehmen.

Das Motiv ist jedoch nicht erst im 2. Jh aufgekommen. Es tritt schon früh ans Licht. In einem seiner ältesten Briefe ermahnt Paulus seine Gemeinde, daß „(ihr) eure Ehre darein setzt, ein stilles Leben zu führen und eure eigenen Angelegenheiten zu besorgen und mit euren Händen zu arbeiten, wie wir euch geboten haben, *ἵνα περιπατῇτε εὐσχημόνως πρὸς τοὺς ἕξω καὶ μηδενὸς χρεῖαν ἔχητε*“ (1 Thess. iv 11-12). Das *εὐσχημόνως* ist Rm. xiii 13 gebraucht in Gegensatz zu einem liederlichen Leben und 1 Cor. xiv 40 neben *κατὰ τάξιν*. Ausführlicher wird das umschrieben in 2 Thess. iii 6 ff. Da zeigt sich auch deutlich, wie dies zur „Überlieferung“, die Paulus der Gemeinde übergeben hat, gehörte (vgl. auch 1 iv 1), und wie er seine eigene Handarbeit dabei als Vorbild hinstellte. Nicht ein ungeregeltes Leben, sondern tüchtige Arbeit, bei der man niemand zur Last wird, gehört zum Christenleben. Das Nichtarbeiten macht das Leben ungeregelt, und das bleibt natürlich nicht beschränkt auf den Kreis der Christen. Die Mitglieder der Gemeinde sollen in ihrem Verhältnis zu draußen, mit Rücksicht auf ²⁵ die Außenstehenden, die Nicht-Christen, ein Leben in guter Ordnung führen. Eine Motivierung gibt der Apostel hier nicht; vielleicht war diese wohl im mündlichen Unterricht gegeben. Aber 1 Cor. xiv 33 cf. v 40 gibt vielleicht eine Begründung: „Gott ist nicht ein Gott der Unordnung (*ἀκαταστασίας*), sondern des Friedens“.

Eine genaue Sachparallele ist Col. iv 5: *ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε*

²⁵ B. Reicke, in Kittel-Friedrich, Bd. VI S. 724.

πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω. Hier ist es mehr eine allgemeine Regel, die nicht wie in 1 Thess. iv 12 auf einen bestimmten Fall angewendet worden ist. Von verschiedenen Kommentatoren wird dies Wort missionarisch aufgefaßt,²⁶ also von der Predigt an die Heiden. Der Kontext in vv. 4 und 6 scheint das nahezulegen. Doch weist das ἀποκρίνεσθαι v. 6 mehr auf eine Verteidigung als auf Missionspredigt (vielleicht auch v 4?). Die Übereinstimmung mit 1 Thess iv 12 zeigt, daß es sich mehr um eine Richtschnur für das Leben handelt, und das wird von dem ältesten „Kommentar“ zu Col, vom Epheserbrief, bestätigt. Die Parallele zu den betreffenden Versen im Col. wird im Eph. nicht im Zusammenhang geboten, und Eph. iv 15 ff. zeigt deutlich, daß die Worte einen ethischen Inhalt haben. „In Weisheit“ bedeutet „mit Einsicht, was der Wille des Herren ist“; sie sollen als Kinder des Lichtes die Werke des Lichts vorzeigen (Eph. iv 8 ff.).²⁷ Eine nähere Begründung wird auch hier nicht gegeben. Es ist jedoch deutlich, daß man auf die Draußenstehenden achtgeben soll und im Verhältnis zu ihnen mit kluger Einsicht und den Befehlen Gottes gehorchend auftreten soll.

In diesem Zusammenhang ist auch 1 Cor. x 32 f. von Bedeutung: ἀπρόσκοποι καὶ Ἰουδαίοις γίνεσθε καὶ Ἑλλήσιν καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ καθὼς καὶ γὰρ πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σύμφορον ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν, ἵνα σωθῶσιν. Sehr richtig bemerkt Stählin²⁸: „Die Vermeidung des πρόσκομμα muß also nicht nur den Brüdern in den Gemeinden gegenüber oberster Leitsatz sein, sondern auch allen Außenstehenden gegenüber, die eben durch die beiden Gruppen der Ἰουδαῖοι und Ἑλλήνες repräsentiert werden“. Er weist auch darauf hin, daß ἀπρόσκοπος hier synonym mit ἀρέσκειν ist, was einen interessanten Zusammenhang mit 2 Klem. xiii gibt (vgl. oben S. 307). Auch hier stellt der Apostel sich selbst als Vorbild hin (s. S. 314 f.). Die Motivierung dieser Richtlinie ist hier deutlich die Rettung der andern, wie auch in der Parallele 1 Cor. ix 19 ff., cf. auch Rm. xiv 13-xv 3. Obwohl Paulus im Vorhergehenden gesagt

²⁶ So z. B. von H. Ridderbos in seinem jüngst erschienenen Kommentar, Kampen 1960. — Sehr stark ist das Werbungselement in der Heiligung der Gemeinde unterstrichen von D. van Swigchem, *Het missionair karakter van de christelijke gemeente volgens de brieven van Paulus en Petrus*, Kampen 1955 (Diss. Freie Universität Amsterdam), S. 57 ff., 86 ff.

²⁷ Vgl. auch Texte wie Rm xii 17, 2 Cor. iv 2, Gal. vi 10, Phil. iv 5, wo stark die Liebe allen Menschen ohne Ausnahme gegenüber unterstrichen wird, speziell Gal. vi 10 ist sehr deutlich.

²⁸ G. Stählin, in Kittel-Friedrich, Bd. VI S. 754.

hat, daß alles εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ geschehen soll, wird hier doch nicht als Motiv die Schmähung seines Namens genannt. Das πρόσκομμα ist hier etwas, wodurch Menschen vom Heil abgehalten werden. Dennoch hat Paulus das Motiv wohl gebraucht in seiner Polemik gegen die Juden (s. S. 310). Ist es zufällig, daß er es nicht im Zusammenhang mit den Christen gebraucht? Bei der Beschaffenheit, in der die paulinische Predigt uns in seinen Briefen bewahrt ist, läßt diese Frage sich wohl nicht entscheiden. Vielleicht weist Rm. xiv 16 in die Richtung eines Gebrauchs: μὴ βλασφημείσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν. Dieser Text spricht nicht von dem „Namen“, sondern vom ἀγαθόν und das ist, wie aus v. 17 hervorgeht, nicht so sehr die christliche Freiheit, sondern die Heilsgabe Gottes.²⁹

In der paulinischen Paränese spielt also die Rücksicht der Christen auf die Heiden eine Rolle. Die Christen sollen als „makellose Kinder Gottes mitten unter einem verkehrten und verdrehten Geschlecht“ leben, unter dem sie leuchten „wie Himmelslichter in der Welt“ (Phil. ii 15). Das soll sich auch im Umgang mit Außenstehenden bewähren; die Motivierung ist der Missionsmöglichkeit entlehnt. Obwohl der Apostel die Verbindung von „Worte“ und „Werke“ kennt (Rm. xv 18 Col. iii 17 2 Thess. ii 17), gebraucht er sie nicht als Gegensatz zueinander, sogar nicht wo er ihn hätte gebrauchen können.

In den Pastoralbriefen wird die Beurteilung der Draußenstehenden erwähnt im Zusammenhang mit der Wahl eines Episkopen (1 Tim. iii 7). Der Kandidat δεῖ δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν ἐμπέσῃ καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου. In ihrer Repräsentation durch ihre Führer soll die Gemeinde gut bekannt sein in der Außenwelt. Dieses Erfordernis zeigt, wie sehr man mit der Reaktion der Nicht-Christen rechnen wollte. Die letzten Worte sind, wie die Kommentare zeigen, in der Einzelerklärung schwer zu deuten; jedenfalls ist es sicher, daß der ὀνειδισμός nicht Schmähung des Gottesnamens, sondern des Episkopen ist. Aber in der Haustafel 1 Tim. vi 1 werden die christlichen Sklaven im Dienst von heidnischen Herren (vgl. daneben v. 2 christliche Herren) gemahnt, „ihre Herren aller Ehre wert zu halten, ἵνα μὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία βλασφημῇται“. Die christlichen Sklaven werden nicht einfach als Sklaven, sondern als Christen beurteilt, und Nachlässigkeit in ihrem Dienst wird nicht nur

²⁹ H. Ridderbos, *Aan de Romeinen*, Kampen 1959, p. 312.

gestraft — Strafdrohung ist hier kein Argument —, sondern sie gereicht zur Schande Gottes und der Lehre des Evangeliums. Und eben das soll zum treuen Dienst antreiben. Positiv wird das gesagt in Tit. ii 10: „nichts zu entwenden, sondern alle gute Treue zu erweisen, damit sie der Lehre Gottes, unseres Heilandes, in allen Stücken zur Zierde gereichen“. In der letzten Haustafel werden auch die jungen Männer zu einem tüchtigen Leben und gesunder Lehre aufgerufen, damit „der Widersacher beschämt wird, weil er nichts Schlechtes von uns sagen kann“ (Tit. ii 8).³⁰ Es wird hier also angenommen, daß Lehre und Leben der Christen mit Argusaugen überwacht werden von den Gegnern (sind das hier die Häretiker, gegen die diese Briefe sich richten?). Ebenso werden die Frauen zu einem reinen Leben ermahnt, „damit das Wort Gottes nicht gelästert wird“ (Tit. ii 5). Auch hier wird wieder die Predigt der Verachtung ausgesetzt durch ein unchristliches Leben (ob „ihre eigenen Männer“ Christen oder Nichtchristen sind, wird nicht gesagt; in jedem Fall wird die Lehre des Evangeliums gelästert, entweder von dem nichtchristlichen Mann oder von der Außenwelt, die eine verfehlte „christliche“ Ehe sieht). Der Verfasser weiß (i 16) von Leuten, die „feierlich erklären, Gott zu kennen, mit den Werken aber ihn verleugnen“. Deshalb wird auch so stark das Tun von guten Werken unterstrichen (z. B. iii 8-10), obwohl deutlich hervorgehoben wird, daß man dadurch nicht gerettet wird (2 Tim. i 9 Tit. iii 5).

Auch im 1 Petrusbrief werden die Christen aufgefordert, „gute Werke“ zu tun,³¹ die von den Heiden beobachtet werden können und eine Widerlegung allerhand übler Nachrede geben (ii 15 iii 16), Nicht-Christen gewinnen (iii 1) und zum Lob Gottes am Urteilstag führen sollen (ii 12). Hier werden wohl die Christen gelästert, aber nicht Gott oder sein Name wegen Verfehlungen der Christen. Hier wird nicht eine negative, sondern eine positive Motivierung gegeben. Im Jakobusbrief wird als letztes Argument gegen eine Bevorzugung von nichtchristlichen Reichen in Frageform festgestellt, daß diese „den schönen Namen, der über euch ausgesprochen worden ist“, lästern (ii 7). Wann und wie sie dies tun, bleibt unsicher. Geschieht

³⁰ Im Kommentar von M. Dibelius-H. Conzelmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe*³, Tübingen 1955, z. St. wird ἐντρέπω mit „bekehren“ übersetzt; besser scheint mir jedoch die übliche Übersetzung mit „beschämen“, s. W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, Sp. 534.

³¹ Darüber habe ich ausführlich gehandelt in *The Teaching of Good Works in 1 Peter*, in: *New Testament Studies* I (1954), p. 92 ff. (In diesem Band, S. 83-105.)

das, wenn sie die Christen vor Gericht ziehen? Hier wird wohl der gewaltige Ernst der Gotteslästerung in Betracht gezogen, aber er funktioniert nicht als direktes Motiv für die Paränese; sie ist nur Warnung davor, nicht die Reichen so unterwürfig zu empfangen.

In diesem Zusammenhang ist auch 1 Klemens xlvii 6 wichtig: „Häßlich, Geliebte, ja sehr häßlich und des Wandels in Christo unwürdig ist es, wenn man hört, daß die hervorragend zuverlässige und alte Gemeinde der Korinther wegen einer oder zweier Personen gegen die Presbyter aufsteht: (7) καὶ αὕτη ἡ ἀκοὴ οὐ μόνον εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐχώρησεν ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἑτεροκλινεῖς ὑπάρχοντας ἀφ' ἡμῶν, ὥστε καὶ βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρεισθαι τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀφροσύνην, ἑαυτοῖς δὲ κίνδυνον ³² ἐπεργάζεσθαι. Zu Unrecht spricht Knopf auch zu dieser Stelle über die Gemeindeehre nach außen als treibenden Beweggrund (das ist wohl der Fall in i 1). Es ist deutlich, daß das Häßliche hier ist, daß die Nicht-Christen von dieser Spaltung gehört haben und auf Grund davon den Herrn lästern. Dies wird nicht in einem direkt-paränetischen Kontext gesagt. Das Faktum der Gotteslästerung, veranlaßt durch das Auftreten dieser Toren, wird als Tatsache festgestellt. Aber zugleich zeigt sich in dem doppelten „häßlich“ die sittliche Entrüstung des Verfassers. Die Ehre Gottes steht auf dem Spiel. Hier zeigt sich einerseits, was tatsächlich geschieht; andererseits läßt sich von hier aus auch verstehen, weshalb die Christen zur Formulierung dieses ethischen Grundsatzes gekommen sind.

Bei Ignatius muß man neben Ad Trall. viii 2 (s. S. 312) auch noch Ad Eph. x 1 und Ad Trall. iii 2 anführen, wo gesagt wird, daß die Christen durch ihre Werke, speziell ihr sanftmütiges Leben, bei den Heiden Ehre finden, ja sie zu Jüngern Christi machen können. Bei Ignatius findet sich also das positive Motiv, Hoffnung auf Einfluß bei den Heiden, neben dem „negativen“, der Warnung, nicht zu Gotteslästerung Anlaß zu geben.

Überblickt man das Material, wie es hier für die Anfangszeit der Kirche geboten ist, dann sieht man, daß

1. schon bald, nachdem das Christentum in die heidnische Welt eingetreten war, Rücksicht auf die Reaktion der Nicht-Christen genommen wird; dies scheint auch zur mündlichen Predigt des Paulus gehört zu haben;

³² „Gefahr“ nicht von seiten der Menschen, sondern als Urteil Gottes, so richtig Knopf, z. St.

2. das Auftreten der Christen keine Verhinderung, um zum Heil zu kommen, für die Nicht-Christen sein soll; die „guten Werke“, die jedem ins Auge fallen, sollen missionarisch wirken, wie sie auch reichlich getan haben. Das hat von Harnack sehr schön geschildert;³³

3. in der steten Spannung zwischen den hohen sittlichen Idealen der christlichen Lehre und der persönlichen Leistung des einzelnen die dauernde Gefahr bestand, daß die Christen hinter ihren Pflichten zurückblieben und daß dies, wenn von den Nicht-Christen bemerkt, nicht nur als ein persönlicher Fehler angesehen wurde, sondern auch die Nicht-Christen zur Schmähung der christlichen Lehre, ja zur Gotteslästerung führte;

4. so etwa am Ende des I Jh.s speziell das letzte, die Gefahr der Gotteslästerung immer mehr ein Motiv in der christlichen Paränese wird; dabei taucht dann plötzlich ein apokryphes Zitat auf, das vor Ignatius bekannt ist und dessen Herkunft bis heute nicht ermittelt werden konnte.

Tatsächliche Erfahrungen in dem Umgang mit Heiden haben wahrscheinlich dazu geführt, daß das rein-theologische Motiv immer stärker wurde. Wie sehr es ein festes Element der Paränese gebildet hat, wird klar aus einem Passus in Tertullians *De Idololatria* 14. Dort tadelt Tertullian seine christlichen Zeitgenossen, daß sie in jeder Hinsicht tun, was die Heiden wünschen, mit der Entschuldigung, „daß der Name nicht gelästert werde“. Er sagt, die Christen hätten dafür zu sorgen, daß die Gotteslästerung nicht durch ihre Missetaten veranlaßt wird. Wenn man jeder Blasphemie der Heiden vorbeugen wolle, dann könne man besser das Christentum aufgeben. Denn in Tertullians Tagen war der Christenname an sich Ursache der Verfluchung. „*Immo blasphemetur dum sumus, in observatione, non in exorbitatione disciplinae; dum probamur, non dum reprobamur*“. Hier sieht man deutlich, wie stark das Motiv, in dem Umgang mit Heiden nicht zu Gotteslästerung Anlaß zu geben, bei den Christen als Richtlinie der Ethik galt. Das führte sogar zu der Konsequenz, daß man auch heidnische Feste mitmachte, also in einen Konflikt der Pflichten. Das Motiv war von seiner paränetischen Grundlage gelöst und funktionierte selbständig mit einer Konsequenz, die zum Teufel führte. Tertullian hat hier die

³³ A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*⁴, Leipzig 1924, Bd. I S. 220 ff.

rechte Verbindung wieder hergestellt, die alte Linie wieder recht aufgenommen.

Die Christen, die da beteten: „Dein Name werde geheiligt“, sollten sich davor hüten, durch ihr Benehmen das Gegenteil zu bewirken. Auch in ihrem täglichen Handeln stand nicht die Ehre der Person oder Gruppe auf dem Spiel, sondern Gottes Ehre. Die Ethik wird in dieser Weise immer mehr theozentrisch motiviert.

In dieser Hinsicht besteht eine Parallele mit Aussagen der jüdischen Ethik. Billerbeck gibt einige Beispiele aus der rabbinischen Literatur, wobei meistens Hes. xxxvi 20-23 als Begründung dient. So sagt in Mekh. Ex. xv 2 R. Simon b. Eleazar (um 190 n. Chr.): „Wenn die Israeliten Gottes Willen tun, dann wird sein Name verherrlicht in der Welt . . . wenn sie aber nicht seinen Willen tun, so wird sein Name gewissermaßen entheiligt in der Welt“, und in Midr. KL. Einl. 15 ist das Faktum der Galuth eine Ursache der Entweihung von Gottes Namen bei den Heiden.³⁴ Daneben gibt es auch noch einige Zeugnisse aus vorchristlicher Zeit, die beide mit Qumran verbunden sind. In der Damaskusschrift p. XII 6-7 heißt es: „Nicht soll man die Hand ausstrecken, eines Heidenmenschen Blut zu vergießen, des Gewinns oder der Beute wegen. Man soll von ihrem Vermögen nicht wegnehmen, damit sie nicht Gelegenheit zum Lästern haben, außer auf Befehl der Gemeinde Israels“,³⁵ wobei der Ausnahmefall sehr merkwürdig ist und eine Kriegszeit voraussetzt; persönliches Auftreten ist verboten. In Test. XII Patr. Naphtali 8, 6 wird in antithetischem Parallelismus mit der Ausführung über „Gutes-tun“ gesagt: τὸν δὲ μὴ ποιοῦντα τὸ καλὸν καταράσσονται αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἀδοξήσει ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ διάβολος οἰκειοῦται αὐτὸν ὡς ἴδιον σκεῦος καὶ πᾶν θηρίον κατακυριεύσει αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Κύριος μισήσει αὐτόν. Hier liegt wohl sachliche Parallelität vor. Direkte Abhängigkeit von seiten der Christen ist nicht nachweisbar, und es muß beachtet werden, daß die Formulierung und Begründung des Motivs verschieden ist.³⁶ Juden und Christen befanden sich als Monotheisten

³⁴ (H. L. Strack-)P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1922, Bd. I S. 414, 417 und Bd. III S. 118.

³⁵ Übersetzung von G. Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes*, Wien 1954, S. 53, vgl. auch den Kommentar von C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*², Oxford 1958, p. 61, der nicht auf Jes. lii 5 verweist, den Text aber wohl im Sinne der Gotteslästerung auffaßt.

³⁶ Obwohl man hier also mit einem bestimmten Thema, einer beherrschenden Richtlinie für die Ethik zu tun hat, blieb es eine ethische Maxime

in derselben Lage. Beide wußten von der Heiligkeit Gottes; für beide war Schmähung seines Namens eine schreckliche Sache, wozu man nicht durch eigene Missetaten Anlaß geben sollte.

Das Christentum lebte in einer Welt, in der viele noch nicht für das Evangelium gewonnen waren. Das Faktum wird mit der Bezeichnung οἱ ἔξω ausgedrückt. Sie sind nicht durch eine Geheimlehre ausgeschlossen. Man war sich bewußt, daß Leben und Lehre beurteilt wurden von den Nicht-Christen. Diese Rücksicht auf sie ist nicht „ein typisches Motiv ‘christlicher Bürgerlichkeit’ “. ³⁷ Es

und hat nicht zu Formulierungen geführt, die der eine von dem anderen abschrieb, eventuell ausweitete. — Es darf hier auch erinnert werden an die oben als Möglichkeit aufgestellte Hypothese, daß der Weheruf aus einer spätjüdischen Apokalypse stammt.

³⁷ Dibelius-Conzelmann, a.a.O., S. 106. — Diese „Bürgerlichkeit“ spielt überhaupt eine große Rolle in diesem Kommentar; m. E. sollen jedoch die so angedeuteten Erscheinungsformen der christlichen Ethik anders gewertet werden als dort geschieht.

Herr Kollege Gerhard Dellling (Halle/Saale) hatte die Freundlichkeit, mich brieflich (6. 11. 1960) auf einige merkwürdige Parallelen hinzuweisen, die sich in den vor kurzem von Dr. Henry Chadwick wieder herausgegebenen Sextus-Sprüchen finden (*The Sentences of Sextus*, ed. H. Chadwick, Cambridge 1959).

Hier lautet Spr. 175 νεκροὶ παρὰ θεῶ δι' οὓς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ λοιδορεῖται und Spr. 396 ἄθλιοι δι' οὓς ὁ λόγος ἀκούει κακῶς. Der gelehrte Herausgeber bemerkt (a.a.O. S. 170) zum Spr. 175: „Cf. Romans ii 24. This looks like a Christian version of 396“. In Zusammenhang mit dem Passus im 2. Klemensbrief (oben S. 307 ff.) darf auch noch Spr. 177 angeführt werden: τοὺς λόγους σου ὁ βίος βεβαιούτω παρὰ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, denn obwohl er in Spr. 359, 383 eine sachliche Parallele hat und ziemlich allgemein klingt, kann er auch, speziell weil er ganz in der Nähe von Spr. 175 steht, sehr wohl von der christlichen Predigt verstanden werden.

Zu Chadwicks Bemerkung erhebt sich die Frage: soll man seine Worte so auffassen, daß Spr. 396 eigentlich ein nicht-christlicher Spruch ist, der später christianisiert wurde? Das scheint mir unmöglich durch den absoluten Gebrauch von λόγος, das doch wohl richtig in der lateinischen Übersetzung als „*verbum dei*“ wiedergegeben wird (so auch J. Kroll, *Die Sprüche des Sextus*, in: E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*² Tübingen 1924, S. 641). Dann wären wohl beide Sprüche christlich.

Bei näherer Betrachtung fällt zweierlei auf: a) in den in meinem Aufsatz besprochenen altchristlichen Texten wird immer vom βλασφημεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα gesprochen; der Wortlaut der Sextus-Sprüche findet sich da nie; b) die Formulierung νεκροὶ παρὰ θεῶ und ἄθλιοι ist sehr hart und steht eigentlich bei Sextus ganz vereinzelt (für νεκρός vgl. R. Bultmann, bei Kittel-Friedrich, Bd. IV, S. 896 ff., s. v.; für ἄθλιος gibt es in: G. W. H. Lampe (ed.), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961 keine christlichen Belege). Hier wird nicht das Urteil über die Lächerer angekündigt, sondern es ist bereits vollzogen. Die Sprüche können beide als Weiterentwicklung von οὐαί aufgefaßt werden. Bevor wir hier jedoch mit Sicherheit sprechen können, sollte erst das in den Sextus-Sprüchen vorliegende ethische Material in seinem Ver-

ist ein Zeichen dafür, daß man Gott und das Evangelium auch im täglichen Leben vollkommen ernst nahm; daß man die Gefahr sah, daß das Leben eines Christenmenschen ein Hindernis für das Evangelium sein kann und anstatt des Wortes der Sündenvergebung zu neuer Sünde veranlaßt.

Deshalb sollten die Christen „mit Weisheit wandeln gegenüber denen, die draußen sind“ (Col. iv 5).

hältnis zum „Heidentum“, Judentum und Christentum weiter geprüft werden, auch nach den ausgezeichneten Untersuchungen, die Chadwick seiner Ausgabe beigegeben hat. Es mag sein, daß die hier besprochenen Aussagen als Leitfossil dienen können. Vorläufig scheint mir die Sachlage diese, daß die in den Sextus-Sprüchen vorliegenden Versionen Um- und Weiterbildungen des oben besprochenen altchristlichen paränetischen Lehrsatzes sind.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT*

In a series of papers such as the ones now being read on the occasion of the jubilee of the "Stipendium Bernardinum" my choice of subject is obvious. Whenever we speak or write about a "doctrine of the Holy Spirit" we also have to consult the New Testament. With the help of a concordance and a little historical and systematic arrangement something will inevitably come out, for the New Testament mentions the Holy Spirit very frequently indeed.

When we start studying this topic, however, we are struck by how little has been written about it. In comparison with Christology, for example, pneumatology has not done too well. Has it been taken for granted? Or is it really impossible to write *about* the Holy Spirit, owing to the contrast between letter and Spirit (cf. 2 Cor. iii 16)? Does the Holy Spirit refuse to be captured in a net of words? Or do we here perceive a general neglect of the "doctrina de Spiritu Sancto"—and, whatever the reason, there is no denying that it *has* been neglected in the dogmatic life of the Church?

And may I remark on another point too? In our day much attention has been devoted to "the church", largely under the influence of the Ecumenical Movement. Scholars have not been slow to investigate the data in the N.T. and primitive Christianity concerning the nature, constitution and significance of the Church. A stream of blessings or iniquities—depending on how we look at it—has sprung forth. But the curious thing is that the Church has been, and still is, regarded as an independent entity, possibly connected with Christology, but hardly ever connected with pneumatology. People seem to have been so terrified by enthusiasts in the history of Christianity that they have not yet recovered. Indeed, this is where the trouble lies—as is proved by a vast variety of sects. I cannot go into this matter in greater detail here, however, but I had to bring it up: the deadlock in the ecumenical discussions can only really be resolved, the discussions only really made to bear fruit, if we stop pursuing repressive tactics where

* First appeared as "De Heilige Geest in het Nieuwe Testament", in *De Spiritu Sancto*, Utrecht 1964, p. 63-75.

pneumatology is concerned and let it come into its own in doctrine and in life.

Writing about the formation of the New Testament canon in the second century Von Harnack said that the Spirit was shut up in a book out of fear of Montanism. Whether this judgement is correct in every respect is as may be. What we cannot deny is that that is what it has amounted to. And together with the book there was also a tightly closed, ever narrower organisation. A process of adjustment, canalization, took place which aroused all sorts of reactions—such as the concept of the Eastern monk as bearer of the Spirit. But at the same time we cannot help feeling that the man in search of something to hold on to has often placed external, tangible certainty too far above the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

Of course we can enquire about the Spirit with a capital S and the spirit with a small s, about the boundaries between the Holy Spirit and “*der Herren eigener Geist*”. Men have struggled with this ever since the days of the apostles, as we see from 1 Jn. iv 1 ff. and Didache xi 7 ff. What are the criteria for distinguishing between the spirits, even nowadays? Questions of hermeneutics, so pressing to many, come into sight here too. But even a glance at the missionary activity in our day—I have Africa and South America in mind—shows us that the problems facing us are weighty and unavoidable.

In my view it is also necessary to examine the problems raised by the Holy Spirit in connection with anthropology—if, that is, we do not wish to use the word “psychology”. What is the “community which has come of age”? What did St Paul mean when he said that the Spirit bears witness with our spirit, that we are children of God (Rom. viii 16) and that the Spirit helps us in our weakness at prayer (Rom. viii 26)? In other words, what does the Spirit do to a man?

I think these few indications are quite sufficient to open our eyes, to show us that we are here dealing not with just “one” chapter of N.T. theology, but a vital issue, a fountain of life for the Church today.

But our topic yet has a deeper significance. When we speak of the “Holy Spirit in the New Testament” we must realize that the entire New Testament is a book of the Holy Spirit. From Mt. i, the birth of Jesus (vs. 20), to Rev. xxii 17, where the Spirit and the Bride call for the coming of the Lord, everything testifies to the

Holy Spirit. The work and the words of Jesus Christ and the apostles are imbued with the Holy Spirit. It is not enough simply to place together all the passages where πνεῦμα ἅγιον is used. We must go further and trace this gift of God, watch it at work, in everything. Pneumatology is no chapter of dogmatics; it is not an element of ethics: it pervades everything. Not even what Martin Dibelius called, in his commentary, the "bourgeois" element of the ethics formulated in the Pastoral Epistles escapes it. The Holy Spirit is the hidden link, the life artery of New Testament testimony and community. We must understand what the Spirit says to the community. Whoever does not understand His words may be learned, but is deaf. This is no intellectual problem: it is existential life.

But having said all this we have not yet, I believe, reached the point where the link—not casual but indissoluble—between Holy Spirit and New Testament becomes visible. The "part of the Holy Spirit" is not merely a very important section of the New Testament; not only does the New Testament speak of the Spirit constantly, from beginning to end. No, the New Testament is unthinkable without the Holy Spirit. Whoever tries to eliminate the Holy Spirit sees the New Testament fade away. All that remains is a collection of maybe interesting, but certainly somewhat alien, primitive Christian writings. What we miss is that which makes the New Testament a "New Testament". This may sound odd, but if we really let the words say what they mean my view will appear to be correct.

Although we may be used to it we cannot deny that "New Testament" is an odd name for a *book* which comprises so strange a group of writings as this. Fortunately we remember that the title is actually a mistranslation of the Greek *diathèkè* and that it is an abbreviation of the true title, "the books of the New Covenant of the gospel", for this is the heading under which the gospels and epistles were collected at the end of the second century. It is a Christian title and the books speak of the "New Covenant". The idea of the Covenant is central here, but the word "new" must also be stressed. The line runs from the institution of the last Supper to Irenaeus, through St Paul, Hebrews, Barnabas and Justin Martyr. What is typical of Christianity is expressed in this idea of the "new covenant", together with, above, and fulfilling, the "old covenant" which was once concluded with Israel through the intermediary of Moses.

The Christians have seen the fulfilment of what was promised in Jeremiah xxxi 31 ff: the forgiveness of sins and the Law written in the heart. Connected with this were the prophecies of Ezechiel xxxvi-xxxvii and Joel iii 1 (R.S.V. ii 28 ff.) who spoke of a future outpouring of God's Spirit which would give the people a new heart. Then the essence of the Covenant will come true: "I will be your God, and you shall be my people".

In the important exposition of the relationship between the Old and the New Covenant given by St Paul in 2 Cor. iii the Spirit plays a decisive role. The Lord, to whom men must turn in order to share in the New Covenant, is the Spirit, and "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom" (2 Cor. iii 17).

In the New Covenant, therefore, the Spirit is not a mere accident, an adjunct which can ultimately be dispensed with. No: the Holy Spirit is decisive, essential. He regulates the new relationship with God, dominates life in the New Covenant. If we analyse the various meanings of *Pneuma* we can say: He is the atmosphere which men breathe.

On the other hand the Spirit can only be understood within the context of the New Covenant. *Pneuma* can of course be mentioned in all sorts of ways (cf. the article by Ed. Schweitzer in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch* of G. Kittel-G. Friedrich), but in the N.T. writers the "Spirit" always appears in connection with the New Covenant—the relationship with God in the forgiveness of sins and righteousness. Of that the Holy Spirit is the guarantor (the *arrhaboon*); and through that we become children of God (Rom viii).

Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit

Can Christology be treated without pneumatology? No, from a point of view they are not two successive entities but are narrowly connected. The "other Counselor" is not simply a substitute (Jn xiv 16 ff.). The relationship is far closer.

The answer to the question why Jesus of Nazareth is the "Christ" runs: because He is anointed with the Holy Spirit.¹ This is clearly stated by St Luke, both in his gospel (iv 17 with an echo of Is. lxi) and in Acts (x 38). He is the Messiah because He is a son of David in the flesh, but a son of God in the Spirit (Rom. i 3 f., which, I

¹ Cf. my article *Jesus the Christ*, *New Testament Studies* 1962, p. 101-116 (p. 248-268 in this volume).

believe, is rightly regarded as a pre-Pauline formulation). Nor should we forget the story of Jesus' Baptism (Mk. i 9 ff. and parallels). In Matthew (i 18 ff.) and Luke (i 35) the Holy Spirit is the decisive "factor" in the account of Jesus' birth.

This indissoluble link between Jesus and the Holy Spirit is not the result of a particular form of wording by any of the evangelists or any unnamed primitive theologian, but goes back to the peculiarity of Jesus' own life. We have only to think of the famous passage, Mk. iii 21, "He is beside himself", and of the curious accusation, made as much as three times in the gospel of St John (NB!), that Jesus has a *daimonion* (vii 20; viii 48; x 20). The miracles which Jesus performs, such as the expulsion of the demons, show that the Kingdom of God has come about, introduced by "the finger of God" (Lk. xi 20) or "the Spirit of God" (Mt. xii 28). Jesus is seen in a line of prophets (cf. Mk. viii 28 and parallels). Peter realized that He was more: the CHRISTOS (vs. 29). Jesus however, does not reveal His Messianic dignity immediately, since the characteristic of His Messiahship is suffering. In the entry into Jerusalem and before the Sanhedrin He reveals Himself as the king. It is particularly the resurrection which confirms this (Acts ii 36), and the Sonship is closely connected with the Messiahship as we see from the account of the baptism.

Jesus is not *the* or an instrument of the Spirit: He is the embodiment of the Spirit. This is forcefully expressed in Jn vii 39: "for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified". Only after His death is the Spirit truly "released". But the effect of the Holy Spirit does not begin in Acts ii: it is already present when Jesus does what God alone can do—when He forgives sins (Mk. ii 7 ff.), the essential element of the New Covenant.

The Spirit shines forth from His preaching, which makes people ask: "What is this? A new teaching with authority" (Mk. i 27). Jesus teaches like a man with power, not like the scribes. This does not mean that He did not speak in parables: it simply conferred on His teaching, which had numerous formal similarities with that of the Rabbis, a quality all His own.

Jesus assigns the New Covenant when He assigns the Kingdom to His disciples at the Last Supper (Lk. xxii 29), as D. Plooy showed in his splendid inaugural address "*Novum Testamentum Regnum aeternum*" (1932). His death stands as a parallel to Ex. xxiv. The New Covenant, however, has a wonderful nature of its own in the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The Spirit and the Apostles

Although the accounts in Jn xx and Acts ii differ in their dating they both point to the fact that after Jesus' death the Spirit is given to His disciples. Here too we can apply the words "As the Father has sent me, even so I send you". The great task committed to them as "witnesses" could only be fulfilled through the power of the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts i 8; x 41, and the use of *martures* and kindred terms in Acts). Their ministry is performed, as St Paul puts it in 1 Cor. ii 4, "not in plausible words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power": this is clearly not a matter of human disposition, but a revelation by God, for the apostle goes on: "that your faith might not rest in the wisdom of men but in the power of God".

This manifestation of the Spirit, however, does not mean that man is simply being passively propelled. The Spirit does not make man into a puppet: on the part of man there is always independent action. This emerges in a curious way from Acts viii 25 and 26, with the clear contrast between the ministry of Peter and John, who return to Jerusalem proclaiming the gospel as they go, and the manner in which the Spirit sets Philip to work.

The Spirit takes the initiative (e.g. in Acts xiii 1 ff.), but the apostles too get down to work on their own. The Spirit also teaches the apostle not to do certain things, as we see from Acts xvi 8 when Paul's plans are twice thwarted and it takes a dream to set him on the right path again. This same effect of the Spirit is equally apparent in the story of the conversion of the eunuch from Ethiopia, and above all from Acts x 11, where the events in Cornelius' house are described. In this last case, above all, it is men, and amongst them even the apostle, who raise objections: Peter is forced, as it were, by the independent descent of the Spirit, a new Pentecost, to realize that Cornelius and his companions are also part of God's people and must therefore be baptized. In both cases the Spirit removes barriers which were still valid in the "old covenant" and creates the new nation. The point is that *all* flesh (Lk. iii 6) will see the salvation of God. We are often only dimly aware of what a colossal breakthrough this was: the barriers of the Law, the Law of God, were broken and the time of salvation made manifest.

What is described in Heb. ii 3-4 is here disclosed. Salvation becomes visible: "It was declared at first by the Lord, and it was attested to us by those who heard him, while God also bore witness

by signs and wonders and various miracles and by gifts of the Holy Spirit distributed according to his own will". The Spirit is the driving force behind all the missionary activity of the apostolic time, showing and preparing the way to the furthest corners of the earth.

The Holy Spirit and the Community

The New Covenant is the indissoluble bond between God and His people, forged by the Holy Spirit. That is why Paul can say: "For we are the temple of the living God; as God said: I will live in them and move among them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people". (2 Cor. vi 16 with an echo of Lev. xxvi 11; Ez. xxxvii 27). To this we can add 1 Cor. iii 16 where the same image of the temple is used: "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you?". Nor does this only apply collectively: it also applies individually, for "your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God" (1 Cor. vi 19). Man, therefore, does not dispose of his body himself: he has become the property of the Other.

Yet this Spirit also stands before the community: He speaks and, as is repeated in Rev. ii and iii, we must hear what the Spirit says to the community. We know that there were prophets who gave new revelations of the Spirit; the best known example is Agabus (Acts xiii 28; xxi 10). Or were they really "new revelations"? In the case of Agabus they were concrete indications of definite events due to take place in the life of the world or of an individual. The danger that "new revelations" were still to be made, like the ones which abounded in various Gnostic writings of the second century, was recognized. This was a danger which had to be combated. Hence the appeal to examine the spirits, for many false prophets had gone out into the world (1 Jn. iv 1 ff.). Hence the "testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" (Rev. xix 11). It is not without reason, both theological and practical, that Jn. xvi 13 makes Jesus say: "He will not speak on his own authority, but whatever he hears he will speak ... for he will take what is mine and declare it to you" (vs. 14). The same passage shows clearly how the Spirit works both without and within: He convinces the world of sin, righteousness and judgement; He leads the disciples to the full truth.

The Spirit speaks to the community through the word of the

Scriptures (Heb. ix 8). He thus gives a decisive power to the word of the Scriptures, but at the same time frees Himself from the letter. The former pupil of the Rabbis knew what "the letter" meant. It is against this background that we must hear the powerful words "the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life" (2 Cor. iii 6). Through the Spirit, which is revealed in the community of the New Covenant—for that is what 2 Cor. iii is about—there is freedom, for "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom" (vs. 17), but it is also through the Spirit that we are bound to the Lord, because it is the Spirit of the Lord.

And just as Jesus of Nazareth was anointed with the Spirit and with power because "God was with him" (Acts x 38), so are the members of the community "in Christ". They are "established in the Anointed One" through God who "has put his seal upon us and given us his Spirit in our hearts as a guarantee" (2 Cor. i 22). Hence the immense spiritual force of the greeting "the Lord is with you".

Heb. vi 4 also speaks about them "who have once been enlightened, who have tasted the heavenly gift, and have become partakers of the Holy Spirit". Baptism is seen as the incorporation in the community of the New Covenant with which the anointing with the Spirit is connected.

Here too, however, the Spirit takes the initiative; He does not appear as a mere adjunct. We can only say that Jesus is the Lord through the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. xii 3). The miracle by which we can call God "Father", by which we have been adopted as God's children (Rom. viii 16), is only possible, and at the same time only real, through the Spirit. The transformation, the renewal of life, so real and so visible in the existence of the Christians (see 1 Cor. vi end) has come about because the community, in the words of St Paul, is "a letter from Christ delivered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts", (2 Cor. iii 3).

This effect of the Spirit is clearly experienced in a number of gifts. St Paul lists an astonishing variety of them: "To one is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom, and to another the utterance of knowledge according to the same Spirit, to another faith by the same Spirit, to another gifts of healing by the one Spirit, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another the ability to distinguish between spirits, to another

various kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues" (1 Cor. xii 8 ff.; cf. the further discussion in chapters xii and xiv). This rich variety, flourishing in divine generosity, so very different from any uniformity, serves the upbuilding of the community, just as the ministries, as a gift of God, contribute to it. It is for the benefit of all. And the fruits of the Spirit come forth in an abundance of expressions: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control (Gal. v 23 ff.).

For through the Spirit the love of God is "poured into our hearts" (Rom. v 5). This Spirit thereby gives fellowship. The apostle saw this well in the bond established between those two groups, "Jews" and "pagans", who were divided from each other by an unbridgeable chasm, far deeper than that dug by any racial prejudice, and who found peace through Jesus Christ (Eph. ii). The description of this miraculous bond ends in the words "for through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father" (vs. 18). Yes, the Spirit bridges gulfs. This did not happen just once, but happens again and again, to such an extent that the apostle could say that he is absent in body, but present in the Spirit (1 Cor. v 3).

This life of the Spirit in the community, and of the community in the Spirit, was a reality seen day after day, not a theoretical possibility or an awaited hope. It was present, as the driving power behind small things and large, hidden and visible. The difficulties did not disappear as if by magic: the account of the times and circle of the apostles provides enough examples of every sort of conflict. But there is a difference between those who resist the Spirit and live "according to the flesh", and those who, within the limits of their earthly existence, allow themselves to be led by the Spirit as children of God—led even to one another.

I have been able to touch on only a few aspects in this paper. But every word which signals one such aspect is laden with the Spirit and conjures up before our eyes the rich variety of God's creative power, held together in the one Lord, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Preaching and profession, service and liturgy—all these activities come from the Spirit who inspires us again and again. It is not the traditions of our fathers or our racial origins which determine life in this domain: Christ's community is gathered from all peoples, nations and tongues.

The Spirit connects us with the past, with the great, all-decisive work which God performed in Jesus the Anointed One; in the

present time He seals human existence in the bond with the Lord; and He propels us towards the future, when the kingdom will be complete. That is why the Spirit gives assurance, obedience and freedom.

The Christian church is *ekklèsia*, God's people of the New Covenant bound with their Lord by the guidance of His Holy Spirit, today as much as yesterday. When we look back on the community as we see it in the New Testament and find that today's individual and communal church life only humbly resembles it with regard to bold profession of faith, and demonstration of life, by dissension and lack of courage, when we dissolve the salutary tension of restraint and freedom into excessive discipline and excessive freedom, we should realise that the New Covenant is not restricted to a certain moment in time—it still exists today. It is through the New Covenant that the Spirit works and inspires us. We do not expect Him to come once more; we know that He is there and still affects us, when we pray:

VENI, CREATOR SPIRITUS.